NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 02 January, 2016

THE

HISTORY OF THE PURITANS;

OR,

PROTESTANT NONCONFORMISTS;

FROM THE

REFORMATION IN 1517.

TO

THE REVOLUTION IN 1688:

COMPRISING AN

66895.

ACCOUNT OF THEIR PRINCIPLES,

THEIR ATTEMPTS FOR A FARTHER REFORMATION IN THE CHURCH,

THEIR SUFFERINGS:

AND THE

LIVES AND CHARACTERS OF THEIR MOST CONSIDERABLE DIVINES.

BY DANIEL NEAL, M.A.

A NEW EDITION, IN FIVE VOLUMES:

REPRINTED FROM THE

TEXT OF DR. TOULMIN'S EDITION,

WITH THE

LIFE OF THE AUTHOR, AND ACCOUNT OF HIS WRITINGS.

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR WILLIAM [illegible] AND SON,

PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1793.

66 R 45

EDITOR'S ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Editor, in revising the first volume of Mr. Neal's "History of the Puritans," was greatly assisted by the author's "Review of the principal facts objected to in that volume." In the volume which is now presented to the public, such aid fails him, as it will also in the succeeding ones, since Dr. Grey's "Examination" did not make its appearance till the declining state of Mr. Neal's health prevented his farther vindication of his work.

The justice due to Mr. Neal's memory and to truth, required the Editor to attempt what could have been done by the author himself with much greater advantage than at this distance of time, from the first statement of the facts, by one who cannot come at all the authorities on which Mr. Neal spake. He has endeavoured, however, to acquit himself with care and impartiality in the examination of Dr. Grey's animadversions, and is not aware that he has passed over any material strictures, extended through a volume of four hundred pages.

Though Dr. Grey's* "Examination" may be now little known or sought after, it received, at its first publication, the thanks of many divines of the first eminence; particularly of Dr. Gibson, then bishop of London, and of Dr. Sherlock, then bishop of Salisbury. The latter prelate, writing to the doctor, said, "It is happy that Mr. Neal's account fell into hands when there was one so well versed in the history, and so able to correct the errors and prejudices. The service you have done must be considered as a very important one by all the friends of the constitution of the church of England."†

* Dr. Zachary Grey was of a Yorkshire family originally from France; he was rector of Houghton Conquest in Bedfordshire, and vicar of St. Peter's and St. Giles's parishes in Cambridge, where he usually passed all his winters, and the rest of his time at Ampthill, the neighbouring market-town to his living. He died Nov. 23, 1766, at Ampthill, in the seventy-fifth year of his age, and was buried at Houghton-conquest. He was of a most amiable, sweet, and communicative disposition, most friendly to his acquaintance, and never better pleased than when performing acts of friendship and benevolence. His publications were numerous.—Anecdotes of Bowyer, p. 534.

† See Anecdotes of Bowyer, p. 536, note.

From the notes in the following pages, the reader will be able to form a judgment whether the encomium bestowed on Dr. Grey's work proceeded from a careful investigation of his remarks, and a comparison of them with Mr. Neal's History and vouchers, or from bias to a cause. In the Editor's apprehensions, the value of Mr. Neal's History and its authorities is, so far as he has proceeded, heightened by the comparison.

In his advertisement to the first volume, he made a great mistake in ascribing the quarto edition of "The History of the Puritans" to the author himself; who died about twelve years before its appearance. It was given to the public by his worthy son, Mr. Nathaniel Neal, of the Million Bank, and is generally esteemed very correct.

There has been pointed out to the Editor a slight error of Mr. Neal, vol. 1. p. 224; who says, that bishop Jewel was educated in Christ's College, Oxford; whereas, according to Fuller and Wood, he was of Corpus Christi.

The Editor has been asked,* on what authority, in the biographical account of Mr. Tomkins, subjoined to p. 17 of the "Memoirs of Mr. Neal," he charged Mr. Asty,† on making an exchange with Mr. Tomkins, one Lord's day, with "alarming the people with the danger of pernicious errors and damnable heresies creeping in among the dissenters, and particularly referring to errors concerning the doctrine of Christ's divinity."

On examining the matter, he finds that he has used the very words, as well as written on the authority, of Mr. Tomkins, who spoke on the information he had received concerning the tenor and strain of Mr. Asty's sermon; and adds, that Mr. Asty himself afterward acknowledged to him, "that the information in general was true, viz. that he spoke of damnable heresies, and applied those texts, 2 Pet. ii. 1 Jude verse 4, or at least one to the new doctrines about the Deity of Christ, that were now, as he apprehended, secretly spreading." Mr. Tomkins was also told, that Mr. Asty was very warm upon these points, but he subjoins, "I must do Mr. Asty this justice, to acquaint others, that he assured me he had no particular view to me or suspicion of me, when he brought down this sermon among others to Newington. As he had an apprehension of the danger of those errors, and of the spreading of them at that time,

* By the Rev. Thomas Towle, a dissenting minister of eminence among the Independents, in an interview, at which the editor was very politely received, and which took place at Mr. Towle's desire, in consequence of a letter written to him by a friend on the subject of the above charge.

† Mr. Asty was grandson of Mr. Robert Asty, who was elected from Stratford in Suffolk. He had good natural parts, and by spiritual gifts, and considerable attainments in literature, was richly furnished for his ministerial province. He was perceived to have drunk very much into the sentiments and spirit of Dr. Owen, who was his favourite author. The amiable traits of his character were, a sweetness of temper, an affectionate sympathy in the afflictions and prosperity of others, a familiarity and condescension of deportment, and a disposition to cast a mantle over the failings of others, and to ask pardon [illegible]. He died Jan. 20, 1729-30, aged 57.—Dr. Grey's [illegible]

he thought it might be seasonable to preach such a sermon any where." When another gentleman, however, put the matter more closely to him, he could not deny that he had some intimation of a suspicion of Mr. Tomkins. But from the assurance Mr. Asty gave Mr. Tomkins, candour will be ready to conclude, that he did not greatly credit the intimation.

Mr. Towle, who was a successor to Mr. Asty in the pastoral office, could scarcely suppose, that he could be guilty of a conduct so remote from the amiable and pacific character he always bore, and from the delineation of it in the funeral sermon for him by Dr. Guyse; who, I find, says of him, "I have with pleasure observed a remarkable tenderness in his spirit, as judging the state of those that differed from him, even in points which he took to be of very great importance."

It will be right to add Mr. Tomkins's declaration with respect to Mr. Asty's views: "I never had a thought that he preached his sermon out of any particular personal prejudice against me; but really believed that he did it from a zeal for what he apprehended to be truth necessary to salvation. Though I am persuaded in my own mind, that this zeal of his in this matter is a mistaken zeal, I do nevertheless respect him as a Christian and a minister."

In the memoirs of Mr. Neal, we mentioned his letter to the Rev. Dr. Francis Hare, dean of Worcester. The Editor has lately met with this piece; it does the author credit, for it is written with ability and temper. He is inclined to give a passage from it, as a specimen of the force of argument it shews, and as going to the foundation of our ecclesiastical establishment.

The dean contended for submission to the authority of the rightful governors of the church; whom he defined to be "an ecclesiastical consistory of presbyters with their bishop at their head." Mr. Neal, to shew that this definition does not apply to the church of England, replies: "Now, taking all this for granted, what an argument have you put into the mouths of the dissenters to justify their separation from the present establishment."

"For is there any thing like this to be found there? Is the church of England governed by a bishop and his presbyters? Is not the king the fountain of all ecclesiastical authority? And has he not power to make ordinances which shall bind the clergy without their consent, under the penalty of a premunire? Does not his majesty nominate the bishops, summon convocations, and prorogue them at pleasure? When the convocations of Canterbury and York are assembled, can they debate upon any subject without the king's licence? Or make any canons that can bind the people without an act of parliament? The bishops in their several courts can determine nothing in a judicial manner about the faith, there lying an appeal from them to the king, who decides it by his commissioners in the court of delegates.

"Now though this may be a wise and prudent institution, yet it can lay no claim to antiquity, because the civil magistrate was not Christian for three hundred years after our Saviour; and conse

quently the dissenters, who are for reducing religion to the standard of the Bible, can be under no obligation to conform to it. We have a divine precept to oblige us to do whatsoever Christ and his apostles have commanded us; but I find no passage of Scripture that obliges us to be of the religion of the state we happen to be born in. If there be any such obligation on the English dissenters, it must arise only from the laws of their country, which can have no influence upon them at present, those laws having been long since suspended by the act of indulgence.

THE

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

THE favourable acceptance of the first volume of this work has encouraged me to publish a second, which carries the history forward to the beginning of the civil war, when the two houses of parliament wrested the spiritual sword out of the hands of the king and bishops, and assumed the supremacy to themselves.

There had been a cessation of controversy for some time before the death of queen Elizabeth; the Puritans being in hopes, upon the accession of a king that had been educated in their own principles, to obtain an easy redress of their grievances; and certainly no prince ever had so much in his power to compromise the differences of the church, as king James I. at the conference of Hampton-court; but being an indolent and vain-glorious monarch, he became a willing captive to the bishops, who flattered his vanity, and put that maxim into his head, "No bishop, no king." The creatures of the court, in lieu of the vast sums of money they received out of the exchequer, gave him the flattering title of an absolute sovereign, and, to supply his extravagances, broke through the constitution, and laid the foundation of all the calamities of his son's reign; while himself, sunk into luxury and ease, became the contempt of all the powers of Europe. If king James had any principles of religion besides what he called kingcraft, or dissimulation, he changed them with the climate, for from a rigid Calvinist he became a favourer of Arminianism in the latter part of his reign; from a Protestant of the purest kirk upon earth, a doctrinal Papist; and from a disgusted Puritan, the most implacable enemy of that people, putting all the springs of the prerogative in motion, to drive them out of both kingdoms.

BUT instead of accomplishing his designs, the number of Puritans increased prodigiously in his reign, which was owing to one or other of these causes.

First. To the standing firm by the constitution and laws of their country; which brought over to them all those gentlemen in the house of commons, and in the several counties of England, who found it necessary, for the preservation of their properties, to oppose the court, and to insist upon being governed according to law: these were called state Puritans.

Secondly. To their steady adherence to the doctrines of Calvin, and the synod of Dort, in the points of predestination and grace, against the modern interpretations of Arminius and his followers. The court divines fell in with the latter, and were thought not only to deviate from the principles of the first reformers, but to attempt a coalition with the church of Rome; while most of the country clergy, being stiff in their old opinions (though otherwise well enough affected to the discipline and ceremonies of the church), were in a manner shut out from all preferment, and branded with the name of Doctrinal Puritans.

Thirdly. To their pious and severe manner of life, which was at this time very extraordinary. If a man kept the sabbath and frequented sermons; if he maintained family religion, and would neither swear, nor be drunk, nor comply with the fashionable vices of the times, he was called a Puritan: this by degrees procured them the compassion of the sober part of the nation, who began to think it very hard, that a number of sober, industrious, and conscientious people, should be harassed out of the land, for scrupling to comply with a few indifferent ceremonies, which had no relation to the favour of God, or the practice of virtue.

Fourthly. It has been thought by some, that their increase was owing to the mild and gentle government of archbishop Abbot. While Bancroft lived, the Puritans were used with the utmost rigour, but Abbot, having a greater concern for the doctrines of the church than for its ceremonies, relaxed the penal laws, and connived at their proselyting the people to Calvinism. Arminianism was at this time both a church and state faction; the divines of this persuasion, apprehending their sentiments not very consistent with the received sense of the thirty-nine articles, and being afraid of the censures of a parliament or a convocation, took shelter under the prerogative, and went into all the slavish measures of the court to gain the royal favour, and to secure to their friends the chief preferments in the church. They persuaded his majesty to stifle the predestinarian controversy, both in the pulpit and press, and would no doubt, in a few years, have got the balance of numbers on their side, if, by grasping at too much, they had not precipitated both church and state into confusion. It was no advantage to those divines that they were linked with the Roman Catholics, for these being sensible they could not be protected by law, cried up the prerogative, and joined the forces with the court divines, to support the dispensing power; they declared for the unlimited authority of the sovereign on the one hand, and the absolute obedience of the subject on the other; so that though there is no real connexion between Arminianism and Popery, the two parties were unhappily combined at this time to destroy the Puritans, and to subvert the constitution and laws of their country.

But if Abbot was too remiss, his successor Laud was as much too furious, for in the first year of his government he introduced as many changes as a wise and prudent statesman would have attempted in seven;* he prevailed with his majesty to set up the Eng-

* Heylin' life of Laud, p. 306.

lish service at Edinburgh, and laid the foundation of the Scots liturgy; he obtained the revival of the book of sports; he turned the communion tables into altars; he sent out injunctions which broke up the French and Dutch churches; and procured the repeal of the Irish articles, and those of England to be received in their place. Such was his rigorous persecution of the Puritans, that he would neither suffer them to live peaceably in the land, nor remove quietly out of it! His grace was also the chief mover in all those unbounded acts of power which were subversive of the rights and liberties of the people; and while he had the reins in his hands, drove so near the precipices of Popery and tyranny, that the hearts of the most resolved Protestants turned against him, and almost all England became Puritan.

I am sensible that no part of modern history has been examined with so much critical exactness, as that part of the reign of king Charles I. which relates to the rise and progress of the civil war; here the writers on both sides have blown up their passions into a flame, and instead of history, have given us little else but panegyric or satire. I have endeavoured to avoid extremes, and have represented things as they appeared to me, with modesty, and without any personal reflections. The character I have given of the religious principles of the long-parliament was designedly taken out of the earl of Clarendon's History of the Grand Rebellion, that it might be without exception: and I am of opinion, that the want of a due acquaintance with the principles of the two houses with regard to church-discipline, has misled our best historians, who have represented some of them as zealous prelatists, and others as cunning Presbyterians, Independents, sectaries, &c. whereas in truth they had these matters very little at heart. The king was hampered with notions of the divine right of diocesan episcopacy, but the two houses [excepting the bishops] were almost to a man of the principles of Erastus, who maintained, that Christ and his apostles had prescribed no particular form of discipline for his church in after ages, but had left the keys in the hands of the civil magistrate, who had the sole power of punishing transgressors, and of appointing such particular forms of church-government from time to time, as were most subservient to the peace and welfare of the commonwealth. Indeed these were the sentiments of our church-reformers, from archbishop Cranmer down to Bancroft. And though the Puritans, in the reign of queen Elizabeth, wrote with great eagerness for the divine right of their book of discipline, their posterity in the next reigns were more cool upon that head, declaring their satisfaction, if the present episcopacy might be reduced to a more primitive standard. This was the substance of the ministers' petition in the year 1641, signed with seven hundred hands. And even those who were for root and branch were willing to submit to a parliamentary reformation, till the Scots revived the notion of divine right in the assembly of divines. However, it is certain, the two houses had no attachment to presbytery or independency, but would have compromised matters with the king upon the episcopal scheme, as long as his majesty was in the field; but

their king and country? Let the disagreeable work be undertaken by men that are better skilled in such unequal severities. I will not examine into the intent of the legislature in this place; but if Protestant Nonconformists are to have no share of trust or power in the government, why are they chosen into such offices, and subject to fines and penalties for declining them? Is it for not serving? this, it seems, is what the legislature never intended. Is it then for not qualifying? surely this is a penalty upon conscience I would ask the warmest advocate for the sacramental test, whether the appointing Protestant dissenters for sheriffs of counties, and obliging them to qualify against their consciences under the penalties of a premunire, without the liberty of serving by a deputy, or of commuting by a fine, is consistent with so full a toleration, and exemption from penal laws, as this writer* says they enjoy? It is true, a good government may take no advantage of this power, but in a bad one men must qualify, or their liberties and estates be at the king's mercy; it seems therefore but reasonable (whatever the intent of the legislature may be), that Protestant dissenters should be admitted to serve their country with a good conscience in offices of trust as well as of burden, or be exempted from all pains and penalties for not doing it.†

It is now pretty generally agreed, that receiving the holy sacrament merely as a qualification for a place of civil profit or trust, is contrary to the ends of its institution, and a snare to the consciences of men;‡ for though the law is open, and "they who obtain offices in the state know beforehand the conditions of keeping them," yet when the bread of a numerous family depends upon a qualification which a man cannot be satisfied to comply with, it is certainly a snare. And though I agree with our author, that "if the minds of such persons are wicked the law does not make them so," yet I am afraid it hardens them, and makes them a great deal worse. How many thousand come to the sacrament of the Lord's supper with reluctance! and, perhaps, eat and drink judgment to themselves; the guilt of which must be chargeable either upon the imposers, or receivers, or upon both. Methinks therefore charity to the souls of men, as well as a concern for the purity of our holy religion, should engage all serious Christians to endeavour the removal of this grievance; and since we are told, that the appearing of the dissenters at this time is unseasonable, and will be ineffectual; I would humbly move our right reverend fathers the bishops not to think it below their high stations and dignities, to consider of some expedient to roll away this reproach from the church and nation, and agree upon some security for the former (if needful) of a civil nature, that may leave room (as king William expresses it in his speech to his first parliament) for the admission of all Protestants that are able and willing to serve their country. The honour of

* History of the Test, p. 25.

† It should be mentioned to the honour of bishop Warburton, who was an advocate for a test, though not a sacramental test, that to this proposal, that "dissenters should be exempted from all pains and penalties for not serving their country in offices of trust," he gave his hearty assent by adding in the margin, *most certainly!* Ed.

‡ History of the Test, p. 22.

Christ, and the cause of public virtue, seem to require it. And forasmuch as the influence of these acts affects great numbers of the laity in a very tender part, I should think it no dishonour for the several corporations in England, as well as for the officers of the army, navy, customs, and excise, who are more peculiarly concerned, to join their interests in petitioning the legislature for such relief. And I flatter myself that the wise and temperate behaviour of the Protestant dissenters in their late general assembly in London; with the dutiful regard that they have always shewn to the peace and welfare of his majesty's person, family, and government, will not fail to recommend them to the royal protection and favour; and that his most excellent majesty, in imitation of his glorious predecessor king William III. will in a proper time recommend it to his parliament to strengthen his administration, by taking off those restraints which at present disable his Protestant dissenting subjects from shewing their zeal in the service of their king and country.

DANIEL NEAL.

London, March 6, 1732—3.

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME.

HISTORY OF THE PURITANS, FROM THE DEATH OF QUEEN ELIZABETH, TO THE BEGINNING OF THE CIVIL WAR IN THE YEAR 1642.

Page

CHAP. I. From the death of queen Elizabeth to the death of archbishop Bancroft. A. D. 1603—1610 . . . 1

CHAP. II. From the death of archbishop Bancroft to the death of king James I. A. D. 1610—1625 . . . 78

CHAP. III. From the death of king James I. to the dissolution of the third parliament of king Charles II. in the year 1628 131

CHAP. IV. From the dissolution of the third parliament of king Charles I. to the death of archbishop Abbot. A. D. 1628—1633 170

CHAP. V. From the death of archbishop Abbot to the beginning of the commotions in Scotland in the year 1637 . 212

CHAP. VI. From the beginning of the commotions in Scotland, to the long parliament in the year 1640 . . 270

CHAP. VII. The character of the long-parliament—their arguments against the late convocation and canons—impeachment of Dr. William Laud, archbishop of Canterbury—votes of the house of commons against the promoters of the late innovations 312

CHAP. VIII. The antiquity of liturgies and of the episcopal order, debated between bishop Hall and SMECTYMNUUS—petitions for and against the hierarchy—root and branch petition—the ministers' petition for reformation—speeches upon the petition—proceedings against Papists 344

Page

CHAP. IX. From the impeachment of the earl of Stafford, to the recess of the parliament upon the king's progress into Scotland. A. D. 1640–41 371

CHAP. X. From the reassembling of the parliament to the king's leaving his palace of Whitehall, Jan. 10, 1641–2. 428

CHAP. XI. From the king's leaving Whitehall to the beginning of the civil war. A. D. 1642 465

CHAP. XII. The state of the church of England—religious character of both parties—summary of the ground of the civil war 503

HISTORY

OF

THE PURITANS.

PART II.—CHAP. I.

FROM THE DEMISE OF QUEEN ELIZABETH TO THE DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT.

The royal house of the Stuarts has not been more calamitous to the English church and nation, in the male descendants, than successful and glorious in the female. The four kings of this line, while in power, were declared enemies of our civil constitution; they governed without law, levied taxes by the prerogative, and endeavoured to put an end to the very being of parliaments. With regard to religion; the two first were neither sound Protestants nor good Catholics, but were for reconciling the two religions, and meeting the Papists half way; but the two last went over entirely to the church of Rome, and died professedly in her communion. The female branches of this family being married among foreign Protestants, were of a different stamp, being more inclined to Puritanism than Popery; one of them [Mary, eldest daughter of king Charles I.] was mother of the great king William III. the glorious deliverer of these kingdoms from Popery and slavery; and another [Elizabeth daughter of king James I.] was grandmother of his late majesty king George I. in whom the Protestant succession took place, and whose numerous descendants in the person and offspring of his present majesty, are the defence and glory of the whole Protestant interest in Europe.

King James was thirty-six years of age when he came to

the English throne, having reigned in Scotland from his infancy. In the year 1589, he married the princess Anne, sister to the king of Denmark, by whom he had three children living at this time, Henry prince of Wales, who died before he was nineteen years of age [1612], Elizabeth married to the elector palatine 1613; and Charles, who succeeded his father in his kingdoms. His majesty's behaviour in Scotland raised the expectations and hopes of all parties; the Puritans relied upon his majesty's education; upon his subscribing the solemn league and covenant; and upon various solemn repeated declarations, in particular one made in the general assembly at Edinburgh 1590; when standing with his bonnet off, and his hands lifted up to heaven, "he praised God that he was born in the time of the light of the gospel, and in such a place, as to be king of such a church, the sincerest [purest] kirk in the world. The church of Geneva (says he) keep Pasche and Yule [Easter and Christmas], what have they for them? They have no institution. As for our neighbour kirk of England, their service is an evil-said mass in English; they want nothing of the mass but the liftings. I charge you, my good ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort the people to do the same; and I, forsooth, as long as I brook my life, shall maintain the same."* In his speech to the parliament 1598, he tells them, "that he minded not to bring in Papistical or Anglicane bishops."† Nay, upon his leaving Scotland, to take possession of the crown of England, he gave public thanks to God in the kirk of Edinburgh, "that he had left both kirk and kingdom in that state which he intended not to alter any ways, his subjects living in peace."‡ But all this was kingcraft, or else his majesty changed his principles with the climate. The Scots ministers did not approach him with the distant submission and reverence of the English bishops, and therefore within nine months

* Calderwood's Hist. of the Church of Scotland, p. 580.

† Ibid. p. 418. James, when settled on the English throne, talked a different language. Dr. Grey quotes different passages to this purport, with a view to invalidate Mr. Neal's authority. The fact is not, that Calderwood falsified, and Mr. Neal through prejudice adopted, his representations, but that James was a dissembler; and, when he wrote what Dr. Grey produces from his works, had thrown off the mask he wore in Scotland. See Harris's Life of James I. p. 25—29.—Ed.

‡ Calderwood, p. 473.

after he ascended the throne of England, he renounced presbytery, and established it for a maxim, No bishop, no king. So soon did this pious monarch renounce his principles (if he had any) and break through the most solemn vows and obligations! When the long parliament addressed king Charles I. to set up presbytery in the room of episcopacy, his majesty objected his coronation oath, in which he had sworn to maintain the clergy in their rights and privileges; but king James had no such scruples of conscience; for without so much as asking the consent of parliament, general assembly, or people, he entered upon the most effectual measures to subvert the kirk-discipline which he had sworn to maintain with hands lifted up to heaven, at his coronation, and had afterward solemnly subscribed with his queen and family, in the years 1581 and 1590.*

The Papists put the king in remembrance, that he was born of Roman-Catholic parents, and had been baptized according to the rites and ceremonies of the church of Rome; that his mother, of whom he usually spoke with reverence, was a martyr for that church; and that he himself, upon sundry occasions, had expressed no dislike to her doctrines, though he disallowed of the usurpations of the court of Rome over foreign princes; that he had called the church of Rome his mother-church; and therefore they presumed to welcome his majesty into England with a petition for an open toleration.†

* Bishop Warburton censures Mr. Neal for not giving, here, the provocation which the king had received from—what he styles "the villanous and tyrannical usage of the kirk of Scotland to him." On this censure it may be observed, that had Mr. Neal gone into the detail of the treatment the king had met with from the Scots clergy, besides the long digression into which it would have led him, it would not have eventually saved the reputation of the king. For Mr. Neal must have related the causes of that behaviour. It arose from their jealousy, and their fears of his disposition to crush them and their religion: founded on facts delivered to them by the English ministry, and from his favouring and employing known Papists. The violation of his solemn reiterated declarations, when he became king of England, shewed how just were those suspicions; and proved him to have been a dissembler. To these remarks it may be added, what provocation constrained him to give the public thanks and promise, with which he left Scotland. See Dr. Harris's Life of James I. p. 25—31, and Burnet's History of his Own Time, vol. 1. p. 5. Edinburgh edition in 12mo.—Ed.

† That the expectations of the Papists were not disappointed, though Dr. Grey controverts Mr. Neal's representation, there is ample proof given by Dr. Harris in his Life of James I. p. 219. 220. "It is certain (says Dr. Warner) that he had on several occasions given great room to suspect, that he was far from being an enemy to the Roman Catholics. Amid all their hopes (he adds), each side had their fears: whilst James himself had properly speaking, no other religion, than what flowed from a principle which he called kingcraft." Warner's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2. p. 476, 477.—Ed.

But the bishops of the church of England made the earliest application for his majesty's protection and favour. As soon as the queen was dead, archbishop Whitgift sent Dr. Nevil, dean of Canterbury, express into Scotland, in the name of all the bishops and clergy of England, to give his majesty assurance of their unfeigned duty and loyalty; to know what commands he had for them with respect to the ecclesiastical courts, and to recommend the church of England to his countenance and favour.* The king replied, that he would uphold the government of the church as the queen left it; which comforted the timorous archbishop, who had sometimes spoke with great uneasiness of the Scotch *mist*.

Upon his majesty's arrival all parties addressed him, and among others the Dutch and French churches, and the English Puritans; to the former his majesty gave this answer, "I need not use many words to declare my good-will to you, who have taken sanctuary here for the sake of religion; I am sensible you have enriched this kingdom with several arts and manufactures; and I swear to you, that if any one shall give you disturbance in your churches, upon your application to me, I will revenge your cause; and though you are none of my proper subjects, I will maintain and cherish you as much as any prince in the world." But the latter, whatever they had reason to expect, met with very different usage.

Notwithstanding all the precautions that were taken to secure the elections of members for the next parliament, the archbishop wished he might not live to see it, for fear of some alteration in the church; for the Puritans were preparing petitions, and printing pamphlets in their own vindication, though by the archbishop's vigilance, says Mr. Strype,† not a petition or a pamphlet escaped without a speedy and effectual answer.

While the king was in his progress to London [April, 1603] the Puritans presented their millenary petition, so called, because it was said to be subscribed by a thousand hands, though there were not more than eight hundred out of twenty-five counties.‡ It is entitled, "The humble petition of the ministers of the church of England, desiring re-

* Life of Whitgift, p. 559. † Strype's Ann. vol. ult. p. 187.
‡ Clark's Life of Hildersham, p. 116, annexed to the General Martyrology.

formation of certain ceremonies and abuses of the church;" the preamble sets forth, "that neither as factious men affecting a popular parity in the church, nor as schismatics aiming at the dissolution of the state ecclesiastical, but as the faithful ministers of Christ, and loyal subjects to his majesty, they humbly desired the redress of some abuses. And though divers of them had formerly subscribed to the service-book, some upon protestation, some upon an exposition given, and some with condition; yet now they, to the number of more than a thousand ministers, groaned under the burden of human rites and ceremonies, and with one consent threw themselves down at his royal feet for relief in the following particulars:

1. In the church-service. "That the cross in baptism, the interrogatories to infants, baptism by women, and confirmation, may be taken away; that the cap and surplice may not be urged; that examination may go before the communion; that the ring in marriage may be dispensed with; that the service may be abridged; church-songs and music moderated to better edification; that the Lord's day may not be profaned, nor the observation of other holidays strictly enjoined; that ministers may not be charged to teach their people to bow at the name of Jesus; and that none but canonical Scriptures be read in the church."

2. Concerning ministers. "That none may be admitted but able men; that they be obliged to preach on the Lord's day: that such as are not capable of preaching may be removed or obliged to maintain preachers; that nonresidency be not permitted; that king Edward's statute for the lawfulness of the marriage of the clergy be revived; and that ministers be not obliged to subscribe but according to law to the articles of religion, and the king's supremacy only."

3. For church-livings. "That bishops leave their commendams; that impropriations annexed to bishopricks and colleges be given to preaching incumbents only; and that lay-impropriations be charged with a sixth or seventh part for the maintenance of a preacher."

4. For church-discipline. "That excommunication and censures be not in the name of lay-chancellors, &c.; that men be not excommunicated for twelvepenny matters, nor without consent of their pastors; that registrars' places, and others having jurisdiction, do not put them out to farm;

that sundry Popish canons be revised; that the length of suits in ecclesiastical courts may be restrained; that the oath *ex officio* be more sparingly used; and licences for marriages without banns be more sparingly granted.

"These things (say they) we are able to shew not to be agreeable to the word of God, if it shall please your majesty to hear us, or by writing to be informed, or by conference among the learned to be resolved."

The king met with sundry other petitions of the like nature, from most of the counties he passed through; but the heads of the two universities having taken offence at the millenary petition, for demising away the impropriations annexed to bishopricks and colleges, which, says Fuller, would cut off more than the nipples of the breasts of both universities in point of maintenance,* expressed their resentment different ways: those of Cambridge passed a grace, June 9th, 1603, "that whosoever in the university should openly oppose by word or writing, or any other way, the doctrine or discipline of the church of England established by law, or any part thereof, should be suspended *ipso facto* from any degree already taken, and be disabled from taking any degree for the future." About the same time the university of Oxford published an answer to the ministers' petition, entitled, "An answer of the vice-chancellor, doctors, proctors, and other heads of houses in the university of Oxford, to the petition of the ministers of the church of England, desiring reformation; dedicated to the king, with a preface to the archbishop, the chancellors of both universities, and the two secretaries of state.† The answer shews the high spirit of the university; it reproaches the ministers in very severe language for subscribing and then complaining; it reflects upon them as factious men, for affecting a parity in the church, and then falls severely on the Scots reformation, which his majesty had so publicly commended before he left that kingdom. It throws an odium upon the petitioners, as being for a limited monarchy, and for subjecting the titles of kings to the approbation of the people. It then goes on to vindicate all the grievances complained of, and concludes with beseeching his majesty not to suffer the peace of the state to be disturbed, by allowing these men to disturb its polity. "Look upon the reformed churches

* Fuller's Church History, b. 10. p. 33. † Life of Whitgift, p. 567.

abroad (say they), and wheresoever the desire of the petitioners takes place, how ill it suits with the state of monarchy; does it become the supereminent authority and regal person of a king, to subject his sovereign power to the overswaying and all-commanding power of a presbytery; that his meek and humble clergy should have power to bind their king in chains, and their prince in links of iron? that is, to censure him, and, if they see cause, to proceed against him as a tyrant. That the supreme magistrate should only be a maintainer of their proceedings, but not a commander in them; these are but petty abridgments of the prerogative royal, while the king submits his sceptre to the sceptre of Christ, and licks the dust of the church's feet. They then commend the present church-government as the great support of the crown, and calculated to promote unlimited subjection, and aver, "that there are at this day more learned men in this land, in this one kingdom, than are to be found among all the ministers of religion in France, Flanders, Germany, Poland, Denmark, Geneva, Scotland, or (to speak in a word) all Europe besides."* Such a vain-glorious piece of self-applause is hardly to be met with. They must have a mean opinion of the king's acquaintance with the learned world, to use him in this manner, at a time, when, though there were some very considerable divines among ourselves, there were as many learned men in the foreign universities, as had been known since the Reformation; witness the Bezas, Scaligers, Casaubons, &c. whose works have transmitted their great names down to posterity.

And that the divines of Cambridge might not come behind their brethren of Oxford, the heads of that university wrote a letter of thanks to the Oxonians, for their answer to the petition, in which "they applaud and commend their weighty arguments, and threaten to battle the Puritans with numbers; for if Saul has his thousands (say they), David has his ten thousands. They acquaint them with their decree of June 9, and bid the poor pitiful Puritans [*homunciones miserrimi*] answer their almost a thousand books in defence of the hierarchy, before they pretend to dispute before so learned and wise a king."† A mean and pitiful

* Strype's Annals, vol. 4. p. 1 i.

† Dr. Warner, with reason on his judgment, supposes that what determined James more than any thing else, to appoint the Hampton-court conference, of which he would be the moderator, was, that he might give his new subject a taste of his talents for

triumph over honest and virtuous men, who aimed at nothing more than to bring the discipline of the church a little nearer the standard of Scripture!

But that his majesty might part with his old friends with some decency, and seem to answer the request of the petitioners, he agreed to have a conference with the two parties at Hampton-court,* for which purpose he published a proclamation from Wilton, October 24th, 1603, touching a meeting for the hearing and for the determining things pretended to be amiss in the church. In which he declares, "that he was already persuaded, that the constitution of the church of England was agreeable to God's word, and near to the condition of the primitive church; yet because he had received information, that some things in it were scandalous, and gave offence, he had appointed a meeting to be had before himself and council, of divers bishops and other learned men, at which consultation he hoped to be better informed of the state of the church, and whether there were any such enormities in it; in the meantime he commanded all his subjects not to publish any thing against the state ecclesiastical, or to gather subscriptions, or make supplications, being resolved to make it appear by their chastisement, how far such a manner of proceeding was displeasing to him, for he was determined to preserve the ecclesiastical state in such form as he found it established by the law, only to reform such abuses as he should find apparently proved."†

The archbishop and his brethren had been indefatigable in possessing the king with the excellency of the English hierarchy, as coming near the practice of the primitive church, and best suited to a monarchial government; they represented the Puritans as turbulent and factious, inconsiderable in number, and aiming at confusion both in church and state; and yet, after all, the old archbishop was doubtful of the event; for in one of his letters to Cecil, afterward earl of Shrewsbury, he writes, "Though our humorous and contentious brethren have made many petitions and motions correspondent to their natures, yet to my comfort they have not much prevailed. Your lordship, I am sure, does imagine,

disputation, of which he was extremely fond and conceited. Eccles. Hist. vol. 1, p. 470.—Ed.

* Life of Whitgift, b. 4. c. 31. p. 568. † Ibid. p. 570

that I have not all this while been idle, nor greatly quiet in mind; for who can promise himself rest among so many vipers?"*

The place of conference was the drawing-room, within the privy chamber at Hampton-court; the disputants on both sides were nominated by the king. For the church, there were nine bishops, and about as many dignitaries, viz. Dr. Whitgift archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Bancroft bishop of London, Dr. Mathew bishop of Durham, Bilson bishop of Winchester, Babington bishop of Worcester, Rudd bishop of St. David's, Watson bishop of Chichester, Robinson bishop of Carlisle, and Dove bishop of Peterborough:—Dr. Andrews dean of the chapel, Overal dean of St. Paul's, Barlow dean of Chester, Bridges dean of Salisbury, Field dean of Gloucester, and King archdeacon of Nottingham; besides the deans of Worcester and Windsor.

For the Puritans were only four ministers, Dr. John Raynolds, Dr. Thomas Sparks, professors of divinity in Oxford, Mr. Chadderton, and Mr. Knewstubs, of Cambridge. The divines of the church appeared in the habits of their respective distinctions; but those for the Puritans in fur gowns, like the Turkey merchants, or the professors in foreign universities. When the king conferred with the bishops he behaved with softness, and a great regard to their character; but when the Puritan ministers stood before him, instead of being moderator, he took upon him the place of respondent, and bore them down with his majestic frowns and threatenings, in the midst of a numerous crowd of courtiers, all the lords of the privy council being present; while the bishops stood by, and were little more than spectators of the triumph.

The account of this conference was published at large only by Dr. Barlow, who, being a party, says Fuller,† set a sharp edge on his own, and a blunt one on his adversaries' weapons. Dr. Sparks and Raynolds complained, that they were wronged by that relation;‡ and Dr. Jackson declared, that Barlow himself repented, upon his death-bed, of the injury he had done the Puritan ministers in his relation of the Hampton-court conference.§ Mr. Strype has lately pub-

* Life of Whitgift, Append. b. 4. no. 43. † Church Hist. b. 10. p. 21.
‡ Pierce, p. 153, 154.
§ "The Puritans (Dr. Harris observes) needed not to have complained so much as they have done of Barlow. If he has not represented their arguments in as just

lished a letter of the bishop of Durham to Hutton archbishop of York, which agrees pretty much with Barlow;* but Mr. Patrick Galloway, a Scotsman, has set things in a different light; from all these, and from the king's own letter to Mr. Blake a Scotsman, we must form the best judgment of it that we can.

The conference continued three days, viz. January 14th, 16th, and 18th; the first was with the bishops and deans alone, January 14th, the Puritan ministers not being present; when the king made a speech in commendation of the hierarchy of the church of England, and congratulated himself that "he was now come into the promised land; that he sat among grave and reverend men, and was not a king, as formerly, without state; nor in a place where beardless boys would brave him to his face. He assured them, he had not called this assembly for any innovation, for he acknowledged the government ecclesiastical, as now it is, to have been approved by manifold blessings from God himself; but because he had received some complaints of disorders, he was willing to remove them if scandalous, and to take notice of them if but trifling; that the reason of his consulting them by themselves, was to receive satisfaction from them, (1.) About some things in the Common Prayer-book; (2.) Concerning excommunication in the ecclesiastical courts; (3.) About providing some well-qualified ministers for Ireland; that if any thing should be found meet to be redressed, it might be done without their being confronted by their opponents."†

In the Common Prayer-book his majesty had some scruples about the confirmation of children, as if it imported a confirmation of baptism. But the archbishop on his knees replied, that the church did not hold baptism imperfect without confirmation. Bancroft said it was of apostolical institution, Heb. vi. 2, where it is called "the doctrine of the laying on of hands." But to satisfy the king, it was agreed that the

light, nor related what was done by the ministers as advantageously, as truth required, he has abundantly made it up to them by showing, that the bishops, their adversaries, were gross flatterers, and had no regard to their sacred characters; and that their mortal foe James had but a low understanding, and was undeserving of the rank he assumed in the republic of learning. This he has done effectually, and therefore, whatever was his intention, the Puritans should have applauded his performance, and appealed to it for proof of the insufficiency of him, who set himself up as a decider of their controversies." Harris's Life of James I. p. 87.—Ed.

* Life of Whitgift, Append. b. 4. no. 1. † Fuller, b. 10. p. 8.

words *examination of children* should be added to confirmation.

His majesty excepted to the absolution of the church, as too nearly resembling the pope's pardon. But the archbishop is said to clear it up to the king's satisfaction; only to the rubric of the general absolution these words were to be added for explanation's sake, *remission of sins*.

He farther objected to private baptism, and baptism by women. It had been customary till this time for bishops to license midwives to their office, and to allow their right to baptize in cases of necessity, under the following oath:

"I Eleanor ——, admitted to the office and occupation of a midwife, will faithfully and diligently exercise the said office, according to such cunning and knowledge as God has given me, and that I will be ready to help and aid as well poor as rich women, being in labour and travail with child, and will always be ready to execute my said office. Also, I will not permit or suffer, that any woman, being in labour or travail, shall name any other to be the father of the child, than only he who is the right and true father thereof; and that I will not suffer any other body's child, to be set, brought, or laid, before any woman delivered of child, in the place of her natural child, so far forth as I can know or understand. Also, I will not use any kind of sorcery or incantation in the time of travail of any woman; and I will not destroy the child born of any woman, nor cut nor pull off the head thereof, or otherwise dismember or hurt the same, or suffer it to be so hurt, &c. Also, that in the ministration of the sacrament of baptism, in the time of necessity, I will use the accustomed words of the same sacrament; that is to say, these words following, or to the like effect, 'I christen thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;' and none other profane words. And that in baptizing any infant born, and pouring water on the head of the said infant, I will use pure and clean water, and not any rose or damask water, or water made of any confection or mixture. And that I will certify the curate of the parish-church of every such baptizing."*

Notwithstanding this oath, Whitgift assured the king, that baptism by women and lay-persons was not allowed by the church. Others said it was a reasonable practice, the

* Strype's Annals, vol. i. p. 537.

minister not being of the essence of the sacrament. But the king not being satisfied, it was referred to consideration, whether the word *curate,* or *lawful minister,* might not be inserted into the rubric for private baptism.

Concerning excommunication for lesser crimes in ecclesiastical courts, it was agreed, that the name should be changed, but the same censure retained, or an equivalent thereunto appointed. These were all the alterations that were agreed upon between the king and bishops in the first day's conference.

Mr. Patrick Galloway, who was present at the conference, gives this account of it to the presbytery of Edinburgh, "that on January 12 the king commanded the bishops, as they would answer it to God in conscience, and to himself upon their obedience, to advise among themselves, of the corruptions of the church in doctrine, ceremonies, and discipline; who after consultation reported, that all was well; but when his majesty with great fervency brought instances to the contrary, the bishops on their knees craved with great earnestness, that nothing might be altered, lest Popish recusants, punished by penal statutes for their disobedience, and the Puritans punished by deprivation from their callings and livings, for nonconformity, should say, they had just cause to insult upon them, as men who had travailed to bind them to that which by their own mouths now was confessed to be erroneous."* Mr. Strype calls this an aspersion; but I am apt to think him mistaken, because Mr. Galloway adds these words, "When sundry persons gave out copies of these actions, I myself took occasion, as I was an ear and eye witness, to set them down, and presented them to his majesty, who with his own hand mended some things, and eked others that I had omitted." It is very certain, that bishop Barlow has cut off and concealed all the speeches that his majesty made against the corruptions of the church, and the practices of the prelates, for five hours together, according to the testimony of Dr. Andrews dean of the chapel, who said, that his majesty did that day wonderfully play the Puritan.

The second day's conference was on Monday, January 16, when the four ministers were called in, with Mr. Galloway minister of Perth in Scotland, on the one part, and two bi-

* Calderwood's Hist. Ch. of Scotland, p. 474.

shops and six or eight deans on the other, the rest being secluded. The king being seated in his chair, with his nobles and privy counsellors around him, let them know, he was now ready to hear their objections against the establishment. Whereupon Dr. Raynolds, in the name of his brethren, humbly requested,

1. That the doctrine of the church might be preserved pure, according to God's word.

2. That good pastors might be planted in all churches, to preach the same.

3. That the Book of Common Prayer might be fitted to more increase of piety.

4. That church-government might be sincerely ministered according to God's word.

1. With regard to the doctrine of the church, he requested, that to those words in the sixteenth article, "We may depart from grace," may be added, *neither totally nor finally*, to make them consistent with the doctrine of predestination in the seventeenth article; and that (if his majesty pleased) the nine articles of Lambeth might be inserted.—That in the twenty-third article these words, "in the congregation," might be omitted, as implying a liberty for men to preach out of the congregation without a lawful call.—That in the twenty-fifth article the ground for confirmation might be examined; one passage confessing it to be a depraved imitation of the apostles, and another grounding it on their example; besides, that it was too much work for a bishop——

Here Bancroft, no longer able to contain himself, falling upon his knees, begged the king with great earnestness to stop the doctor's mouth, according to an ancient canon, that schismatics are not to be heard against their bishops. It is not reasonable, says he, that men who have subscribed to these articles, should be allowed to plead against their own act, contrary to the statute 1st Eliz. The king, perceiving the bishop in a heat, said, My lord, you ought not to interrupt the doctor, but either let him proceed, or answer what he has objected. Upon which he replied, "that as to Dr. Raynolds's first objection, the doctrine of predestination was a desperate doctrine; and had many people libertines, who were apt to say, 'If I shall be saved, I shall be saved;' he therefore desired it might be left at large. That

his second objection was trifling, because, by the practice of the church, none but licensed ministers might preach or administer the sacrament. And as to the doctor's third objection he said, that the bishops had their chaplains and curates to examine such as were to be confirmed; and that in ancient time, none confirmed but bishops." To which Raynolds replied in the words of St. Jerome, "that it was rather a compliment to the order, than from any reason or necessity of the thing." And whereas the bishop had called him a schismatic, he desired his majesty, that that imputation might not lie upon him; which occasioned a great deal of mirth and raillery between the king and his nobles, about the unhappy Puritans. In conclusion the king said, he was against increasing the number of articles, or stuffing them with theological niceties; because, were they never so explicit, there will be no preventing contrary opinions. As to confirmation, he thought it not decent to refer the solemnity to a parish-priest; and closed his remarks with this maxim, No bishop, no king.

After a long interruption the doctor went on, and desired a new catechism, to which the king consented, provided there might be no curious questions in it, and that our agreement with the Roman Catholics in some points might not be esteemed heterodoxy. He farther desired a new translation of the Bible, to which his majesty agreed, provided it were without marginal notes, saying, that of all the translations, the Geneva was the worst, because of the marginal notes, which allowed disobedience to kings. The doctor complained of the printing and dispersing Popish pamphlets, which reflecting on Bancroft's character, the king said, "What was done of this kind was by warrant from the court, to nourish the schism between the seculars and Jesuits, which was of great service. Doctor, you are a better collegeman than statesman." To which Raynolds replied, that he did not intend such books as were printed in England, but such as were imported from beyond sea; and this several of the privy council owned to be a grievance. The doctor having prayed that some effectual remedy might be provided against the profanation of the Lord's day, declared he had no more to add on the first head.

2. With regard to preaching, the doctor complained of

pluralities in the church; and prayed, that all parishes might be furnished with preaching ministers. Upon which Bancroft fell upon his knees, and petitioned his majesty, that all parishes might have a praying ministry; for preaching is grown so much in fashion, says he, that the service of the church is neglected. Besides, pulpit harangues are very dangerous; he therefore humbly moved, that the number of homilies might be increased, and that the clergy might be obliged to read them instead of sermons, in which many vented their spleen against their superiors. The king asked the plaintiffs their opinion of the bishop's motion; who replied, that a preaching minister was certainly best and most useful, though they allowed, where preaching could not be had, godly prayers, homilies, and exhortations, might do much good. The lord-chancellor [Egerton] said, there were more livings that wanted learned men, than learned men living; let all therefore have single coats before others have doublets. Upon which Bancroft replied merrily, But a doublet is good in cold weather. The king put an end to the debate, by saying, he would consult the bishops upon this head.

3. But the doctor's chief objections were to the service-book and church-government. Here he complained of the late subscriptions, by which many were deprived of their ministry, who were willing to subscribe to the doctrinal articles of the church, to the king's supremacy, and to the statutes of the realm. He excepted to the reading the Apocrypha; to the interrogatories in baptism, and to the sign of the cross; to the surplice, and other superstitious habits; to the ring in marriage; to the churching of women by the name of purification. He urged, that most of these things were relics of Popery; that they had been abused to idolatry, and therefore ought, like the brazen serpent, to be abolished. Mr. Knewstubs said, these rites and ceremonies were at best but indifferent, and therefore doubted, whether the power of the church could bind the conscience without impeaching Christian liberty.

Here his majesty interrupted them, and said, that he apprehended the surplice to be a very comely garment; that the cross was as old as Constantine, and must we charge him with Popery? besides, it was no more a significant sign than imposition of hands, which the petitioners allowed in

ordination; and as for their other exceptions, they were capable of being understood in a sober sense; "but as to the power of the church in things indifferent (says his majesty), I will not argue that point with you, but answer as kings in parliament, *Le Roy s'avisera.* This is like Mr. John Black, a beardless boy, who told me the last conference in Scotland, that he would hold conformity with me in doctrine, but that every man as to ceremonies was to be left to his own liberty, but I will have none of that; I will have one doctrine, one discipline, one religion in substance and ceremony: never speak more to that point, how far you are bound to obey."

4. Dr. Raynolds was going on to complain of excommunication by lay-chancellors; but the king having said that he should consult the bishops on that head, the doctor desired that the clergy might have assemblies once in three weeks; that in rural deaneries they might have the liberty of prophesyings, as in archbishop Grindal's time; that those cases which could not be resolved there, might be referred to the archdeacon's visitation, and from thence to the diocesan synod, where the bishop with his presbyters should determine such points as were too difficult for the other meetings.——Here the king broke out into a flame, and instead of hearing the doctor's reasons, or commanding his bishops to answer them, told the ministers, that he found they were aiming at a Scots presbytery, "which (says he) agrees with monarchy as well as God and the devil; then Jack and Tom, Will and Dick, shall meet, and at their pleasure censure both me and my council. Therefore, pray stay one seven years before you demand that of me, and if then you find me pursy and fat, and my windpipe stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you; for let that government be up, and I am sure I shall be kept in breath; but till you find I grow lazy, pray let that alone. I remember how they used the poor lady my mother in Scotland, and me in my minority." Then turning to the bishops, he put his hand to his hat and said, "My lords, I may thank you that these Puritans plead for my supremacy, for if once you are out and they in place, I know what would become of my supremacy, for, No bishop, no king. Well, doctor, have you any thing else to offer?" Dr. Raynolds, 'No more, if it please your majesty.' Then rising from his chair, the

king said, "If this be all your party have to say, I will make them conform, or I will hurry them out of this land, or else worse;" and he was as good as his word.

Thus ended the second day's conference, after four hours' discourse, with a perfect triumph on the side of the church; the Puritan ministers were insulted, ridiculed, and laughed to scorn, without either wit or good manners. One of the council said, he now saw that a Puritan was a Protestant frighted out of his wits. Another, that the ministers looked more like Turks than Christians, as appeared by their habits. Sir Edward Peyton confessed, that Dr. Raynolds and his brethren had not freedom of speech; but finding it to no purpose to reply, they held their peace. On the other hand, the bishops and courtiers flattered the king's wisdom and learning beyond measure, calling him the Solomon of the age. Bancroft fell upon his knees, and said, "I protest my heart melteth for joy, that Almighty God, of his singular mercy, has given us such a king, as since Christ's time has not been." Chancellor Egerton said, "he had never seen the king and priest so fully united in one person."* His majesty was no less satisfied with his own conduct; for in his letter to Mr. Blake a Scotsman, he told him, that he had soundly peppered off the Puritans, that they had fled before him, and that their petitions had turned him more earnestly against them. "It were no reason (says his majesty) that those who refuse the airy sign of the cross after baptism, should have their purses stuffed with any more solid and substantial crosses.——They fled me so from argument to argument, without ever answering me directly *(ut est eorum moris)*, that I was forced to tell them, that if any of them, when boys, had disputed thus in the college, the moderator would have fetched them up, and applied the rod to their buttocks——I have a book of theirs that may convert infidels, but shall never convert me, except by turning me more earnestly against them."——This was the language of the Solomon of the age. I leave the reader to judge, how much superior this wise monarch was in the knowledge of antiquity, or the art of syllogism, to Dr. Raynolds, who was the oracle of his time for acquaintance

* A modern prelate has said, 'Sancho Panha never made a better speech, nor more to the purpose, during his government.' Bishop Warburton's notes on Neal.—Ed.

with ecclesiastical history, councils, and fathers, and had lived in a college all his days.

The third day's conference was on Wednesday Jan. 18, when the bishops and deans were first called into the privy chamber with the civilians, to satisfy the king about the high-commission and the oath *ex officio*, which they might easily do as being principal branches of his prerogative. When the king said he approved of the wisdom of the law in making the oath *ex officio*, the old archbishop was so transported, as to cry out, "Undoubtedly your majesty speaks by the special assistance of God's Spirit." A committee of bishops and privy-counsellors was then appointed to consider of lessening the charges in the high-commission, and for planting schools, and proper ministers in the kingdom of Ireland, and on the borders of England and Scotland. After which Dr. Raynolds and his brethren were called in, not to dispute, but only to hear the few alterations or explanations in the Common Prayer-book already mentioned; which not answering their expectations, Mr. Chadderton fell on his knees, and humbly prayed, that the surplice and cross might not be urged on some godly ministers in Lancashire; and Mr. Knewstubs desired the same favour for some Suffolk ministers; which the bishops were going to oppose, but the king replied with a stern countenance, "We have taken pains here to conclude in a resolution for uniformity, and you will undo all by preferring the credit of a few private men to the peace of the church; this is the Scots way, but I will have none of this arguing, therefore let them conform, and that quickly too, or they shall hear of it; the bishops will give them some time, but if they are of an obstinate and turbulent spirit, I will have them enforced to conformity."*

Thus ended this mock conference, for it deserves no better name, all things being previously concluded between the

* "In this manner ended this conference; which (observes Dr. Warner) convinced the Puritans they were mistaken in depending on the king's protection; which convinced the king that they were not to be won by a few insignificant concessions; and which, if it did not convince the privy council and the bishops that they had got a Solomon for their king, yet they spoke of him as though it did." Eccles. Hist. vol. 1. p. 482.

"This conference (says another writer) was but a blind to introduce episcopacy in Scotland; all the Scotch noblemen then at court being designed to be present, and others, both noblemen and ministers, being called up from Scotland by the king's letter to assist at it." Dr. Welwood, as quoted by Crosby. Hist. of Engl. Baptists, vol. 1. p. 6 i.—Ed.

king and the bishops, before the Puritans were brought upon the stage, to be made a spectacle to their enemies, and borne down not with calm reason and argument, but with the royal authority, I approve or I dissent; the king making himself both judge and party.* No wonder, therefore, if Dr. Raynolds fell below himself, and lost some part of his esteem with the Puritans, being overawed by the place and company, and the arbitrary dictates of his sovereign opponent. The Puritans refused to be concluded by this conference, for the following reasons, because,

1. "The ministers appointed to speak for them were not of their nomination or choosing, nor of one judgment in the points of controversy; for being desired by their brethren to argue against the corruptions of the church as simply evil, they replied, they were not so persuaded. Being farther desired to acquaint the king, that some of their brethren thought them sinful, they refused that also. Lastly, being desired to give their reasons in writing, why they thought the ceremonies only indifferent; or to answer the reasons they had to offer to prove them sinful, they would do neither one nor other.

2. "Because the points in controversy were not thoroughly debated, but nakedly propounded, and some not at all touched. Neither was there any one argument to the purpose pursued and followed.

3. "Because the prelates took the liberty of interrupting at their pleasure those of the other side, insomuch that they were checked for it by the king himself."

They objected also to the account of the conference by Dean Barlow, as published without the knowledge, advice, or consent, of the other side, and therefore deserving no credit; they said that Dr. Moreton had called some part of it in question, and rectified some speeches fathered on the king: besides, that the prelates only were present at the first day's conference, when the principal matters were determined.

* The conclusion of his address to the Puritan ministers, at this conference, as it was a curious specimen of the king's logic, so it was a proof of the insolent and tyrannical spirit, with which he aimed to bear down all opposition. "If (said he) this be all your party hath to say, I will make them conform themselves, or else I will harrie them out of the land, or else do worse, only hang them, that's all." It is very evident, from this, that he trusted more, as it has been observed by a modern writer, to the power of hanging than of convincing his adversaries. Secret History of the Court and Reign of Charles II. vol. 1. Introduction, p. 23, the note.—Ed.

"Therefore the Puritan ministers offer (if his majesty will give them leave) in one week's space to deliver his majesty in writing, a full answer to any argument or assertion propounded in that conference by any prelate; and in the meantime they do aver them to be most vain and frivolous."

If the bishops had been men of moderation, or if the king had discovered any part of that wisdom he was flattered with, all parties might have been made easy at this time; for the bishops, in such a crisis, would have complied with any thing his majesty had insisted on; but the king's cowardice, his love of flattery, his high and arbitrary principles, and his mortal hatred of the Puritans, lost one of the fairest opportunities, that had ever offered, to heal the divisions of the church.

On the 5th of March the king published a proclamation, in which he says, "that though the doctrine and discipline of the established church were unexceptionable, and agreeable to primitive antiquity, nevertheless he had given way to a conference, to hear the exceptions of the Nonconformists, which he had found very slender; but that some few explanations of passages had been yielded to for their satisfaction; therefore he now requires and enjoins all his subjects to conform to it, as the only public form established in this realm; and admonishes them not to expect any farther alterations, for that his resolutions were absolutely settled." The Common Prayer-book was accordingly printed with the amendments, and the proclamation prefixed.

It was a high strain of the prerogative, to alter a form of worship established by law, merely by a royal proclamation, without consent of parliament or convocation; for by the same power that his majesty altered one article in the liturgy, he might set aside the whole, every sentence being equally established by act of parliament; but this wise monarch made no scruple of dispensing with the laws. However, the force of all proclamations determining with the king's life, and there being no subsequent act of parliament to establish these amendments, it was urged very justly in the next reign, that this was not the liturgy of the church of England established by law, and consequently not binding upon the clergy.

A fortnight before this conference was held, the learned and reverend Mr. Thomas Cartwright, one of the chief of

the Puritans, and a great sufferer for nonconformity died. He was born in Hertfordshire, 1535, and entered into St. John's college, Cambridge, 1550, where he became a hard student, never sleeping above five hours in a night. During the reign of queen Mary he left the university, and became a lawyer's clerk; but upon the accession of queen Elizabeth he resumed his theological studies, and was chosen fellow of Trinity-college in the year 1563. The year following he bore a part in the philosophy act before the queen. In the year 1567, he commenced bachelor of divinity, and three years after was chosen lady Margaret's professor. He was so popular a preacher, that when his turn came at St. Mary's, the sexton was obliged to take down the windows. But Mr. Cartwright venturing in some of his lectures to shew the defects of the discipline of the church, as it then stood, he was questioned for it before the vice-chancellor, denied his doctor's degree, and expelled the university, as has been related. He then travelled to Geneva, and afterward became preacher to the English merchants at Antwerp. King James invited him to be professor in his university of St. Andrew's, which he declined. After his return from Antwerp he was often in trouble by suspensions, deprivations, and long imprisonment; at length the great earl of Leicester, who knew his worth, made him governor of his hospital in Warwick, where he ended his days, December 27, 1603. He was certainly one of the most learned and acute disputants of his age, but very ill used by the governing clergy. He wrote several books besides his controversy with archbishop Whitgift, as, his Latin comment on Ecclesiastes, dedicated to king James, in which he thankfully acknowledges his being appointed professor to a Scots university: his celebrated confutation of the Rhemist translation of the New Testament, to which work he was solicited not only by sir Francis Walsingham, but by letter under the hands of the principal divines of Cambridge, as, Roger Goad, Wm. Whitaker, Thomas Crooke, John Ireton, Wm. Fulke, John Field, Nicholas Crane, Gibs Seintho, Rich. Gardiner, Wm. Clarke, &c. Such an opinion had these great men of his learning and abilities. He was a person of uncommon industry and piety, fervent in prayer, a frequent preacher, and of a meek and humble spirit. In his old age he was so troubled with the stone and

gout by frequent lying in prisons, that he was obliged always to study on his knees. His last sermon was on Eccles. xii. 7. "Then shall the dust return to the earth, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." The Tuesday following he was two hours on his knees in private prayer, and a few hours after quietly resigned his spirit to God, in the sixty-eighth year of his age, and was buried in his own hospital. The famous Mr. Dod preached his funeral sermon.*

Six weeks after died his great antagonist Dr. John Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury; who was born at Great Grimsby in Lincolnshire in the year 1530, and educated in Pembroke-hall, and was fellow of Peter-house, Cambridge. He complied with the changes in Queen Mary's reign, though he disapproved of her religion. He commenced doctor of divinity 1569; and was afterward Margaret and queen's professor,† and master of Trinity-college. Having been a celebrated champion for the hierarchy, the queen advanced him first to the bishoprick of Worcester, and then to the archbishopric of Canterbury. He was a severe governor of the church, pressing conformity with the utmost rigour,‡ in which her majesty always gave him her countenance and support. He regarded neither the entreaties of poor ministers, nor the intercessions of courtiers, being steady to the laws, and even outgoing them in the cause of uniformity. Mr. Fuller says, he would give fair words and good language, but would abate nothing. Sir G. Paul, the writer of his life, says, that choler was his chief infirmity,§ which has sufficiently appeared by the account already given of the many persecutions, oppressions, and unjustifiable hardships, the Puritans suffered under his administration; notwithstanding which they increased prodigiously, insomuch, that towards the latter end of his life his grace grew weary of the invidious employment; and being afraid of king James's first parliament,‖ died, as it is said, with grief before it met, desiring rather to give an account of his bishoprick to God than exercise it among men.¶ He had been at court

* Clarke's Lives annexed to his General Martyrology, p. 16.

† For his sake the salary of lady Margaret's professorship was raised from twenty marks to 20*l*. And it is observed to his honour, that this prelate was the great restorer of order and discipline in the university of Cambridge, when deeply wounded and almost sunk. Granger's Hist. of England, 8vo. vol. I. p. 206.—Ed.

‡ "Even sometimes it may be (says Dr. Warner) beyond all other law, but that of her majesty's pleasure."—Ed. § Life of Whitgift, p. 108.

‖ Fuller's Church Hist. b. 10. p. 25.

¶ Strype's words, Dr. Grey says, are, "Et nunc Domino exaltata est mea anima,

the first Sunday in Lent, and as he was going to the council-chamber to dinner, was seized with the dead palsy on the right side, and with the loss of his speech; upon which he was carried first to the lord-treasurer's chamber, and afterward to Lambeth, where the king visited him on Tuesday, but not being able to converse, he lifted up his eyes and hand, and said, *Pro ecclesia Dei*, which were his last words. He would have written something, but could not hold his pen. His disease increasing he expired the next day, being the 29th of February 1603, aged seventy-three, and was buried at Croydon on the 27th of March following, where he has a fair monument, with his effigies at length upon it. He was an hospitable man, and usually travelled with a great retinue; in the year 1589, he came into Canterbury with a train of five hundred horse, of which one hundred were his own servants. He founded an hospital and free school at Croydon, and though he was a cruel persecutor of the Puritans, yet, compared with his successor Bancroft, he was a valuable prelate.

Before the meeting of the parliament the king issued out two proclamations, one commanding all Jesuits and priests in orders to depart the kingdom [February 22, 1603], wherein he was very careful to let the world know, that he did not banish them out of hatred to the Catholic religion; but only for maintaining the pope's temporal power over princes.* The other was against the Puritans, in which there was no indulgence for tender consciences;—all must conform, or suffer the extremities of the law.†

The king opened the first session of parliament with a long speech, in which there are many strokes in favour of tyranny and arbitrary power: "his majesty acknowledges the Roman church to be his mother-church, though defiled with some infirmities and corruptions. That his mind was

---

quod in eo tempore succubui quando mallem episcopatûs mei reddere rationem, quam inter homines excrescere."—Ed.

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 165 [illegible] ed.

† "The Puritans about this time (says Mrs. Macaulay) suffered so severe a persecution, that they were driven to offer a petition for relief to the king, whilst he was taking the diversion of hunting. James was something startled at this unexpected intrusion, and very graciously directed them to depute ten of their members to declare their grievances to the council. These deputies no sooner made their appearance before the council, than they were sent to jail; and sir Francis Hastings, sir Edward Montague, and sir Valentine Knightly, under whose protection they had thus acted, were turned out of the lieutenancy of the county and the commission of the peace." Winwood's Memorials quoted by Mrs. Macaulay, History of England, vol. 1. p. 7. note, 8vo.—Ed.

ever free from persecution for matters of conscience, as he hopes those of that religion have proved since his first coming. He pities the laity among them, and would indulge their clergy, if they would but renounce the pope's supremacy, and his pretended power to dispense with the murder of kings. He wishes that he might be a means of uniting the two religions, for if they would but abandon their late corruptions, he would meet them in the midway, as having a great veneration for antiquity in the points of ecclesiastical policy. But then as to the Puritans or Novelists, who do not differ from us so much in points of religion, as in their confused form of policy and purity; those (says he) are discontented with the present church-government; they are impatient to suffer any superiority, which makes their sect insufferable in any well-governed commonwealth."*

The bishops and their adherents were pleased with this speech, because the king seemed resolved not to indulge the Puritans at any rate; the Catholics did not like his majesty's distinction between the laics and clerics; but the Puritans had most reason to complain, to see so much charity expressed towards Papists, and so little for themselves.† All Protestants in general heard with concern the king's offer to meet the Papists half-way. What does he mean? say they; is there no difference between Popery and Protestantism, but the pope's authority over princes? Are all other doctrines to be given up? Are the religions the same? And, is this the only point upon which we separated from the church of Rome? Thus unhappily did this pretended Protestant prince set out, with laying the foundation of discontent among all ranks of his people.

His majesty made frequent mention in his speech of his hereditary right to the crown, and of his lineal descent. That he was accountable to none but God; and that the only difference between a rightful king and a tyrant is, that the one is ordained for preserving the prosperity of his people, the other thinks his kingdom and people are ordained to satisfy his unreasonable appetites.‡ Farther, his majesty altered the writs for electing members, and took upon him to describe what sort of representatives should be elected, not by way of exhortation but of command, and as indispen-

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 165, 166, folio ed. † Ibid. p. 167, 168, folio ed.
‡ Ibid. vol. 2. p. 152. Coke, p. 51.

sable conditions of their being admitted into the house, and which were to be judged of and determined in the court of chancery.* He threatened to fine and disfranchise those corporations that did not choose to his mind; and to fine and imprison their representatives if they presumed to sit in the house. When the house of commons met he interrupted their examinations of elections, and commanded the return of sir Francis Goodwin, whose election they had set aside, to be brought before him and his judges. Most of those who approached the king's person laboured to inspire him with the design of making himself absolute; or rather, to confirm him in that resolution.† The bishops were of this number; and from this time there has appeared among the clergy a party of men, who have carried the obedience of the subject, and the authority of the crown, as high as in the most arbitrary monarchies.

But though the court and bishops were so well agreed, the parliament passed some acts which gave them uneasiness; as the revival of the statute of Edward VI. which enacts, that all processes, citations, judgments, &c. in any ecclesiastical courts, shall be issued in the king's name, and under the king's seal of arms. The bishops were said to be asleep when they suffered this clause to pass; but the Laudean clergy broke through it afterward, as they did through every thing else that stood in the way of their sovereignty. It was farther enacted, that all leases or grants of church-lands to the king, or his heirs, &c. for more than twenty-one years for the future, should be made void; which put an effectual stop to the alienation of the church's revenues. The marriages of the clergy were also legitimated, by reviving the statute of king Edward VI. for that purpose.‡

The convocation which sat with the parliament was very active against the Puritans. The see of Canterbury being vacant, Bancroft bishop of London presided, and produced the king's licence to make canons.§ May 2, 1603, he de-

* "This (as Dr. Warner well observes) was directly striking at the privileges of the commons." Ed.

† We are told, in particular, that Cecil assured James, on his coming to the crown, "that he should find his English subjects like asses, on whom he might lay any burden, and should need neither bit nor bridle but their asses' ears." "His reign, however, affords sufficient proof (observes a late writer) that the king himself was the only ass, and that the English lions were not to be intimidated by his silly braying." Secret History of the Court and Reign of Charles II. vol. 1. Introduction, p. 30, note.—Ed. ‡ Heylin's Hist. Presb. p. 175. § Strype's Annals, vol. 1. p. 396.

livered a book of canons of his own preparing to the lower house for their approbation. About the same time Mr. Egerton, Fleetwood, Wotton, Clark, and other Puritan divines, presented a petition for reformation of the Book of Common-prayer; but instead of receiving it, they admonished them and their adherents to be obedient and conform, before Midsummer-day, or else they should undergo the censures of the church. In the meantime the canons were revising. May 25, there was a debate in the upper house upon the cross in baptism, when Bancroft and some others spoke vehemently for it; but Dr. Rudd, bishop of St. David's, stood up, and made the following speech for charity and moderation:

—"For my part, I acknowledge the antiquity of the use of the cross, as mentioned in Tertullian, and after him in St. Cyprian, St. Chrysostom, Austin, and others. I also confess the original of the ceremony to have sprung by occasion of the Pagans, who reproached the ancient Christians for believing in Christ crucified; and that in Popery it has been superstitiously abused; and I affirm, that it is in the church of England now admitted and entertained by us, and restored to its ancient integrity, all superstition abandoned.

"Likewise I wish, that if the king's highness shall persist in imposing it, all would submit to it (as we do) rather than forego the ministry in that behalf. But I greatly fear, by the report which I hear, that very many learned preachers, whose consciences are not in our custody, nor to be disposed of at our devotion, will not easily be drawn thereunto; of which number, if any shall come in my walk, I desire to be furnished beforehand, by those that be present, with sufficient reasons to satisfy them (if it be possible) concerning some points which have been now delivered.

First, "Whereas sundry passages of Scripture have been alleged for the cross; as, 'God forbid that I should rejoice save in the cross of Christ;' and divers others of the like sense; if any of the adverse opinion fall into my company, and say, that those scriptures are figurative, implying the death and passion of our Saviour Christ; and that to draw an argument from them to justify the sign of the cross in the forehead, is an insufficient kind of reasoning, and a fallacy; what answer shall I make unto them?

Secondly, "Whereas I have observed upon present rela-

tion, that the impugners of this ceremony were heard at large in the conference at Hampton-court, and having objected the example of Hezekiah, who broke in pieces the brazen serpent, after it had been abused to idolatry, and therefore the sign of the cross (which was not brought into the church by God's express command, as the brazen serpent was, but was from the beginning a mere invention of men) ought now to be taken away by reason of the superstitious abuse which is sustained in Popery; they received answer, That king Hezekiah might have preserved it, abandoning the abuse of it, if it had pleased him, and consequently it is in the king's majesty's power to abolish this ceremony, having been abused, or to retain it in manner aforesaid. Hereunto I say, that I was one of the conference, yet I was not at that part of the conference, where those that stood for reformation had access to the king's majesty's presence, and liberty to speak for themselves; for that I, and some other of my brethren the bishops, were secluded from that day's assembly; but I suppose it to be true, as it has formerly been reported, and I for my own particular admit the consequence put down above. Now, because I wish all others abroad as well satisfied herein as ourselves that be here present, if any of the contrary opinion shall come to me, and say, that the aforesaid answer does not satisfy them, because they think there is as great reason now to move them to become petitioners to his majesty for abolishing the cross in baptism, as there was to move the godly zealous in Hezekiah's time to be petitioners for defacing the brazen serpent, because the church-going Papists now among us do superstitiously abuse the one, as the Israelites did the other; what sound answer shall I make to them for their better satisfaction?

Thirdly, "Whereas it has been this day alleged, that it is convenient and necessary to preserve the memory of the cross of Christ by this means; if haply any of the other side shall come to me, and say, that the memory of the cross of Christ might be sufficiently and more safely preserved by preaching the doctrine of the gospel, the sum whereof is 'Christ crucified;' which was so lively preached to the Galatians, as if his bodily image had been crucified among them; and yet we know not of any material or signal cross that was

in use in the church at that; I desire to know what satisfaction or answer must be given to them.

"Moreover, I protest, that all my speeches now are uttered by way of proposition, not by way of opposition, and that they all tend to work pacification in the church; for I put great difference between what is lawful and what is expedient, and between them that are schismatical, and them that are scrupulous only upon some ceremonies, being otherwise learned, studious, grave, and honest men.

"Concerning these last, I suppose, if upon the urging them to absolute subscription, they should be stiff, and choose rather to forego their livings, and the exercise of their ministry, though I do not justify their doings herein, yet surely their service will be missed at such a time, as need shall require us and them to give the right hand of fellowship one to another, and to go arm in arm against the common adversary.——

"Likewise consider who must be the executioners of their deprivation; even we ourselves the bishops, against whom there will be a great clamour of them and their dependants, and many others who are well affected towards them, whereby our persons will be in hazard to be brought into extreme dislike or hatred.

"Also remember, that when the Benjamites were all destroyed, saving six hundred, and the men of Israel sware in their fury that none of them would give his daughter to the Benjamites to wife, though they suffered for their just deserts, yet their brethren afterward lamented, and said, 'There is one tribe cut off from Israel this day; and they used all their wits, to the uttermost of their policy, to restore that tribe again.

"In like sort, if these our brethren aforesaid shall be deprived of their places for the matter premised, I think we should find cause to bend our wits to the utmost extent of our skill, to provide some cure of souls for them, that they may exercise their talents.

"Furthermore, if these men, being divers hundreds, should forsake their charges, who, I pray you, should succeed them? Verily, I know not where to find so many able preachers in this realm unprovided for; but suppose there were, yet they might more conveniently be settled in the

seats of unpreaching ministers. But if they are put in the places of these men that are dispossessed, thereupon it will follow, 1. That the number of preaching ministers will not be multiplied. 2. The church cannot be so well furnished on a sudden; for though the new supply may be of learned men from the universities, yet will they not be such ready preachers for a time, nor so experienced in pastoral government, nor so well acquainted with the manners of the people, nor so discreet in their carriage, as those who have already spent many years in their ministerial charge.

"Besides, forasmuch as in the time of the late archbishop of Canterbury these things were not so extremely urged, but that many learned preachers enjoyed their liberty conditionally, that they did not by word or deed openly disturb the state established, I would know a reason why they should now be so generally and exceeding straitly called upon, especially since there is a greater increase of Papists lately than heretofore.

"To conclude, I wish, that if by petition to the king's majesty there cannot be obtained a quite remove of the premises, nor yet a toleration for them that are of more staid and temperate carriage, yet at least there might be procured a mitigation of the penalty."*

The bishops of London, Winchester, Ely, and Lincoln, answered the bishop of St. David's; but when his lordship would have replied, he was forbid by the president, and submitted; affirming, that as nothing was more dear to him than the peace of the church, he was determined to use the best means he could to draw others to unity and conformity with himself, and the rest of his reverend brethren. And thus the debate ended.

The book of Canons found an easy passage through both houses of convocation, and was afterward ratified by the king's letters patent under his great seal; but not being confirmed by act of parliament, it has several times been adjudged in the courts of Westminster-hall, that they bind only the clergy, the laity not being represented in convocation. The book contains one hundred and forty-one articles,

* Dr. Grey also gives this speech of bishop Rudd, at length, inserting in brackets some words and clauses both from Mr. Pierce and Mr. Thomas Baker's MSS. omitted by Mr. Neal, in order to convict himself of inaccuracy: but from the nature of them it should seem, that these omissions proceeded not from negligence, but design, as not essential to bishop Rudd's argument.—Ed.

collected out of the injunctions, and other episcopal and synodical acts of the reigns of king Edward VI. and queen Elizabeth, and are the same that are now in force. By these we discern the spirit of the church at this time, and how freely she dispensed her anathemas against those who attempted a farther reformation. The canons that relate to the Puritans deserve a particular mention, because (however illegally) they suffered severely under them.

"Canon 3. says, that whosoever shall affirm, that the church of England by law established is not a true and apostolical church, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored but only by the archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of his wicked error.

"Canon 4. Whosoever shall affirm the form of God's worship in the church of England established by law, and contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and administration of sacraments, is a corrupt, superstitious, and unlawful worship, or contains any thing repugnant to Scripture, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto* and not restored, &c.

"Canon 5. Whosoever shall affirm, that any of the thirty-nine articles of the church, agreed upon in the year 1562, for avoiding diversity of opinions, and for establishing consent touching true religion, are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe to, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, &c.

"Canon 6. Whosoever shall affirm, that the rites and ceremonies of the church of England by law established, are wicked, antichristian, superstitious, or such as, being commanded by lawful authority, good men may not with a good conscience approve, use, or, as occasion requires, subscribe, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, &c.

"Canon 7. Whosoever shall affirm, the government of the church of England, by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, and the rest that bear office in the same, is antichristian, or repugnant to the word of God, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, &c.

"Canon 8. Whosoever shall affirm, that the form and manner of making and consecrating bishops, priests, or deacons, contains any thing repugnant to the word of God; or that persons so made and consecrated are not lawfully

made, or need any other calling or ordination to their divine offices, let him be excommunicated, *ipso facto*, and not restored, &c.

"Canon 9. Whosoever shall separate from the communion of the church of England, as it is approved by the apostles' rules, and combine together in a new brotherhood, accounting those who conform to the doctrines, rites, and ceremonies, of the church unmeet for their communion, let them be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, &c.

"Canon 10. Whosoever shall affirm that such ministers as refuse to subscribe to the form and number of God's worship in the church of England, and their adherents, may truly take to themselves the name of another church not established by law, and shall publish, that their pretended church has groaned under the burden of certain grievances, imposed on them by the church of England, let them be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, &c.

"Canon 11. Whosoever shall affirm, that there are within this realm, other meetings, assemblies, or congregations, of the king's born subjects, than such as are established by law, which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful churches, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, &c.

"Canon 12. Whosoever shall affirm that it is lawful for any sort of ministers or lay-persons to make rules, orders, and constitutions, in causes ecclesiastical, without the king's authority, and shall submit to be ruled and governed by them, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, &c.

"Canon 98. We decree and appoint, that after any judge ecclesiastical hath proceeded judicially against obstinate and factious persons, for not observing the rites and ceremonies of the church, or for contempt of public prayer, no judge *ad quem* shall admit or allow of an appeal, unless he having first seen the original appeal, the party appellant do first personally promise and vow, that he will faithfully keep and observe all the rites and ceremonies of the church of England, as also the prescript form of common prayer; and do likewise subscribe the three articles formerly by us specified and declared."

They who are acquainted with the terrible consequences

of an excommunication in the spiritual courts, must be sensible of the new hardships put upon the Puritans by these canons: suspensions and deprivations from their livings, were not now thought sufficient punishments for the sin of nonconformity; but the Puritans, both clergy and laity, must be turned out of the congregation of the faithful; they must be rendered incapable of suing for their lawful debts; they must be imprisoned for life by process out of the civil courts, or until they make satisfaction to the church; and when they die, they must be denied Christian burial; and, so far as lies in the power of the court, be excluded the kingdom of heaven. O uncharitableness! Papists excommunicate Protestants, because, by renouncing the Catholic faith, they apprehended them guilty of heresy; but for Protestants of the same faith to excommunicate their fellow-Christians and subjects, and deprive them of their liberties, properties, and estates, for a few ceremonies, or because they have not the same veneration for the ecclesiastical constitution with themselves, is hardly to be paralleled.

To take notice of a few more of the canons: canon 14 forbids the minister to add to, or leave out, any part of the prayers. Canon 18 enjoins bowing at the name of Jesus. Canons 17, 24, 25, 58, 74, enjoin the wearing the habits in colleges, cathedrals, &c. as copes, surplices, hoods. Canon 27 forbids giving the sacrament to schismatics, or to any but such as kneel, and allow of the rites, ceremonies, and orders, of the church. Canon 28 says, that none shall be admitted to the sacrament but in their own parish. Canon 29, That no parent shall be urged to be present, nor be admitted to answer as a godfather for his own child in baptism. Canon 30 declares the sign of the cross to be no part of the substance of the sacrament of baptism, but that the ordinance is perfect without it. Canon 33 prohibits ordination without a presentation, and says, that if any bishop ordain without a title, he shall maintain the person till he be provided with a living. Canon 36 and 37 say, that no person shall be ordained, or suffered to preach, or catechise in any place as a lecturer, or otherwise, unless he first subscribe the three articles following; 1. That the king's majesty is the supreme head and governor of this realm, as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical, as temporal causes.

2. That the Book of Common Prayer, &c. contains nothing contrary to the word of God, and that he will use it and none other. 3. That he alloweth the thirty-nine articles of 1562, to be all and every one of them agreeable to the word of God. To these he shall subscribe in the following form of words:

I N. N. do willingly, and *ex animo*, subscribe to these three articles above mentioned, and to all things that are contained in them.

Canon 38 says, that if any minister, after subscription, shall disuse the ceremonies, he shall be suspended; then after a month be excommunicated, and after another month be deposed from his ministry. Canon 55 contains the form of bidding prayer before sermon; "ye shall pray for Christ's holy catholic church," &c. the original of which I have accounted for. Canon 82 appoints, "that convenient and decent tables shall be provided in all churches for the celebration of the holy communion, and the same tables shall be covered in times of divine service with a carpet of silk, or other convenient stuff; and with a fair linen cloth at the time of the administration, as becometh that table, and so stand, saving when the said holy communion is to be administered; at which time the same shall be placed in so good sort within the church or chancel, as thereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and administration; and the communicants also more conveniently, and in more numbers, may communicate with the said minister; and a convenient seat shall be made for the minister to read service in."

The other canons relate to the particular duties of ministers, lecturers, churchwardens, parish-clerks; to the jurisdiction and business of ecclesiastical courts, with their proper officers, as, judges ecclesiastical, surrogates, proctors, registrars, apparitors, &c. The book concludes with denouncing the sentence of excommunication, 1. Against such as shall affirm, that this synod thus assembled, is not the true church of England by representation. 2. Against such as shall affirm, that persons not particularly assembled in this synod, either clergy or laity, are not subject to the decrees thereof, as not having given their voices to them. 3. Against such as shall affirm, this sacred synod was a

company of such persons as did conspire against godly and religious professors of the gospel, and therefore that they and their proceedings ought to be despised and contemned, though ratified and confirmed by the royal supremacy and authority.

The king, in his ratification of these canons, commands them to be diligently observed and executed; and for the better observation of the same, that every parish-minister shall read them over once every year in his church, on a Sunday or holiday, before divine service; and all archbishops, bishops, and others, having ecclesiastical jurisdiction, are commanded to see all and every the same put in execution, and not spare to execute the penalties in them severally mentioned on those that wilfully break or neglect them. I shall leave the reader to make his own comment on the proceedings of this synod, only observing, that when they had finished their decrees, they were prorogued to January, 1605—6, when, Dr. Overal being prolocutor, they gave the king four subsidies, but did no more church-business till the time of their dissolution, in the year 1610.

Dr. Bancroft bishop of London, being translated to the see of Canterbury [December 1601], was succeeded by Vaughan bishop of Chester, a corpulent man, and of little activity; upon his advancement the Dutch and French ministers within his diocess presented him with an address for his protection and favour, wherein they set forth, "that their churches were granted them by charter from pious king Edward VI. in the year 1550; and that, though they were again dispersed by the Marian persecution, they were restored to their churches and privileges by queen Elizabeth, in the year 1558, from which time they have been in the uninterrupted possession of them. It appears from our records (say they) how kind and friendly the pious Grindal was to us; and what pains the prudent bishop Sandys took in composing our differences. We promise ourselves the like favour from your lordship, &c.—for whom we shall always pray, &c.—"* Monsieur de la Fontaine delivered the address, with a short Latin speech, to whom the bishop replied, "I thank you, most dear brethren, for your kind address; I am sensible of the merits of John Alasco, Uten-

* Address of the French and Dutch churches to the bishop of London, Strype's Annals, vol. 1. p. 590.

hovius, and Edmund Grindal bishop of London;* superintendants of your churches; and of the rest of my predecessors in this bishoprick, who had reason to take your churches, which are of the same faith with our own, under their patronage, which I also am ready to do. I have known your churches twenty-five years to have been beneficial to the kingdom, and serviceable to the church of England, in which the devil, the author of discord, has kindled the fire of dissension, into which I pray you not to pour oil, but to endeavour by your counsels and prayers, to extinguish."† Thus the foreign churches enjoyed full peace, while his majesty's own subjects, of the same faith and discipline with them, were harassed out of the kingdom.

Bancroft was a divine of a rough temper, a perfect creature of the prerogative, and a declared enemy of the religious and civil liberties, of his country. He was for advancing the prerogative above law, and for enlarging the jurisdiction of the spiritual courts, by advising his majesty to take from the courts of Westminster-hall, to himself, the whole right of granting prohibitions; for this purpose he framed twenty-five grievances of the clergy, which he called *articuli cleri*, and presented them to the king for his approbation; but the judges having declared them to be contrary to law, they were set aside.

His grace revived the persecution of the Puritans, by enforcing the strict observance of all the festivals of the church; reviving the use of copes, surplices, caps, hoods, &c. according to the first service-book of king Edward; obliging the clergy to subscribe over again to the three articles of Whitgift, which by the late canon [no. 36.] they were to declare they did willingly, and from the heart. By these methods of severity above three hundred Puritan ministers‡ were silenced or deprived; some of whom were excommunicated and cast into prison, others were forced to leave the native country and livelihood, and go into banish-

* Utenhovius and Edmund Grindal, as Dr. Grey observes, are not mentioned in the bishop's answer, though they were in Fontaine's speech.—Ed.

† Strype's Annal., vol. 3. p. 395.

‡ This account is controverted by Dr. Grey, on the authority of Heylin's Aer. Rediviv. p. 376; who says, "that by the rolls brought in by bishop Bancroft before his death it appears, that there had been but forty-five deprived on all occasions; which, in a realm containing nine thousand parishes, could be no great matter. But it was, that by the punishment of some of the principals, he struck such a general terror into all the rest, that insolorunity grew out of fashion in less time than could be easily imagined."—Ed.

ment, to preserve their consciences. I say, says Mr. Collyer, to preserve their consciences, for it is a hard thing to bring every body's understanding to the common standard, and to make all honest men of the same mind.*

To countenance and support the archbishop's proceedings the king summoned the twelve judges into the star-chamber, and demanded their judgments upon three questions; there were present the bishops of Canterbury and London, and about twelve lords of the privy council.

The lord-chancellor opened the assembly with a sharp speech against the Puritans, as disturbers of the peace, declaring, that the king intended to suppress them, by having the laws put in execution;† and then demanded, in his majesty's name, the opinion of the judges in three things:

Q. 1. "Whether the deprivation of Puritan ministers by the high commissioners, for refusing to conform to the ceremonies appointed by the last canons, was lawful?

The judges replied, "that they had conferred thereof before, and held it to be lawful, because the king had the supreme ecclesiastical power, which he has delegated to the commissioners, whereby they have the power of deprivation, by the canon law of the realm, and the statute 1st Eliz. which appoints commissioners to be made by the queen, but does not confer any new power, but explain and declare the ancient power; and therefore they held it clear, that the king without parliament might make orders and constitutions for the government of the clergy, and might deprive them if they obeyed not; and so the commissioners might deprive them; but that the commissioners could not make any new constitutions, without the king. And the divulging such ordinances by proclamation is a most gracious admonition. And forasmuch as they [the Puritans] have refused to obey, they are lawfully deprived by the commissioners *ex officio*, without libel, *et ore tenus convocati*.

Q. 2. "Whether a prohibition be grantable against the commissioners upon the statute of 2 Henry V. if they do not deliver the copy of the libel to the party?"

The judges replied, "that that statute was intended where the ecclesiastical judge proceeds *ex officio, et ore tenus*."

Q. 3. "Whether it be an offence punishable, and what

† Eccles. Hist. p. 687.

* Croak's Reports, Mich. term, 2 Jac. part 2. p. 37. parag. 13.

punishment they deserved, who framed petitions, and collected a multitude of hands thereto, to prefer to the king in a public cause, as the Puritans had done, with an intimation to the king, that if he denied their suit many thousands of his subjects would be discontented?"

The judges replied, "that it was an offence finable at discretion, and very near to treason and felony in the punishment, for it tended to the raising sedition, rebellion, and discontent among the people." To which unaccountable resolution all the lords agreed.

By these determinations the whole body of the clergy are excluded the benefit of the common and statute law; for the king without parliament may make what constitutions he pleases: his majesty's high commissioners may proceed upon these constitutions *ex officio;* and the subject may not open his complaints to the king, or petition for relief, without being finable at pleasure, and coming within danger of treason or felony.*

Before the breaking up of the assembly, some of the lords declared, that the Puritans had raised a false rumour of the king, as intending to grant a toleration to Papists; which offence the judges conceived to be heinously finable by the rules of common law, either in the King's-bench, or by the king in council; or now, since the statute of 3 Henry VII. in the star-chamber. And the lords severally declared, that the king was discontented with the said false rumour, and had made but the day before a protestation to them, that he never intended it, and that he would spend the last drop of blood in his body before he would do it; and prayed, that before any of his issue should maintain any other religion than what he truly possessed and maintained, that God would take them out of the world. The reader will remember this solemn protestation hereafter.

After these determinations the archbishop resumed fresh courage, and pursued the Puritans without the least compassion. A more grievous persecution of the orthodox faith, says my author, is not to be met with in any prince's reign. Dr. John Burges, rector of Sutton-Colefield, in one of his letters to king James, says, the number of Nonconformists in the counties he mention, were six or seven hundred,

* "This (as Dr. Warner well observes) was making the king absolute in all ecclesiastical affairs, without any limitation or redress: and it was intended probably as a step to make him so in the state." Ed.

agreeable to the address of the Lincolnshire ministers, hereafter mentioned.*

The whole clergy of London being summoned to Lambeth, in order to subscribe over again, many absconded, and such numbers refused, that the church was in danger of being disfurnished, which awakened the court, who had been told that the Nonconformists were an inconsiderable body of men. Upon this surprising appearance the bishops were obliged to relax the rigour of the canons for awhile; and to accept of a promise from some, to use the cross and surplice; from others to use the surplice only; and from others a verbal promise that they might be used, not obliging themselves to the use of them at all; the design of which was to serve the church by them at present, till the universities could supply them with new men; for they had a strict eye upon those seminaries of learning, and would admit no young scholar into orders without an absolute and full subscription to all the articles and canons.

Bancroft, in a letter to his brethren the bishops, dated December 18, 1604, gives the following directions: "As to such ministers as are not already placed in the church, the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh canons are to be observed; and none are to be admitted to execute any ecclesiastical function without subscription. Such as are already placed in the church are of two sorts: 1. Some promise conformity, but are unwilling to subscribe again. Of these, forasmuch as the near affinity between conformity and subscription gives apparent hopes, that being men of sincerity, they will in a short time frame themselves to a more constant course, and subscribe to that again, which by their practice they testify not to be repugnant to the word of God; your lordship may (an act remaining upon record of

* The number of nonsubscribers in

Oxfordshire were	9	Kent	23	Sussex	47
Dorsetshire	17	Lincolnshire	33	Cheshire	12
Nottinghamshire	20	Devon and Cornwall	51	Somersetshire	17
Norfolk	28	Suffolk	74	Lancashire	21
Buckinghamshire	33	Staffordshire	14	London	30
Leicestershire	57	Hertfordshire	17	Warwickshire	44
Bedfordshire	16	Surrey	21	Northamptonshire	57
Derbyshire	20	Wiltshire	31	Essex	57

In the twenty-four counties above mentioned 710

From whence it is reasonable to conclude, that in the fifty-two counties of England and Wales there were more than double the number.

such their offer and promise) respite their subscription for some short time. 2. Others in their obstinacy will yield neither to subscription, nor promise of conformity; these are either stipendiary curates, or stipendiary lecturers, or men beneficed; the two first are to be silenced, and the third deprived." He adds, "that the king's proclamation of July 16, 1604, admonishes them to conform to the church, and obey the same, or else to dispose of themselves and their families some other way, as being men unfit, for their obstinacy and contempt, to occupy such places; and besides, they are within the compass of several laws."

The Puritans who separated from the church, or inclined that way, were treated with yet greater rigour. Mr. Maunsel, minister of Yarmouth, and Mr. Lad, a merchant of that town, were imprisoned by the high-commission, for a supposed conventicle, because that on the Lord's day, after sermon, they joined with Mr. Jackler, their late minister, in repeating the heads of the sermon preached on that day in the church. Mr. Lad was obliged to answer upon oath certain articles, without being able to obtain a sight of them beforehand; and after he had answered before the chancellor, was cited up to Lambeth to answer them again before the high commissioners upon a new oath, which he refusing, without a sight of his former answer, was thrown into prison, where he continued a long time, without being admitted to bail. Mr. Maunsel the minister was charged farther, with signing a complaint to the lower house of parliament, and for refusing the oath *ex officio*; for which he also was shut up in prison without bail. At length being brought to the bar upon a writ of *habeas corpus*, and having prevailed with Nic. Fuller, esq. a bencher of Gray's-Inn, and a learned man in his profession, to be their counsel; he moved, that the prisoners might be discharged, because the high commissioners were not empowered by law to imprison, or to administer the oath *ex officio*, or to fine any of his majesty's subjects. This was reckoned an unpardonable crime, and, instead of serving his clients, brought the indignation of the commissioners upon himself. Bancroft told the king, that he was the champion of the Nonconformists, and ought therefore to be made an example, to terrify others from appearing for them; accordingly he was shut up in close prison, from whence neither the intercession of his friends, nor

his own humble petitions could obtain his release to the day of his death.*

This high abuse of church-power obliged many learned ministers and their followers to leave the kingdom, and retire to Amsterdam, Rotterdam, the Hague, Leyden, Utrecht, and other places of the Low Countries, where English churches were erected after the presbyterian model, and maintained by the states according to treaty with queen Elizabeth, as the French and Dutch churches were in England. Besides, the English being yet in possession of the cautionary towns, many went over as chaplains to regiments, which together with the merchants that resided in the trading cities, made a considerable body. The reverend and learned Dr. William Ames, one of the most acute controversial writers of his age, settled with the English church at the Hague; the learned Mr. Robert Parker, a Wiltshire divine, and author of the Ecclesiastical Policy, being disturbed by the high-commission, retired to Amsterdam, and afterward became chaplain to the English regiment at Doesburgh, where he died. The learned Mr. Forbes, a Scots divine, settled with the English church at Rotterdam; as Mr. Pots, Mr. Paget, and others, did at Amsterdam and other places.

But the greatest number of those who left their native country for religion were Brownists,† or rigid Separatists, of whom Mr. Johnson, Ainsworth, Smith, and Robinson,

* Pierce's Vindication, p. 174.

† These conscientious exiles, driven from their own country by persecution, instead of meeting with a hospitable reception or even a quiet refuge in Holland, were there "loaded with reproaches, despised and afflicted by all, and almost consumed with deep poverty." The learned Ainsworth, we are told, lived upon ninepence a week and some boiled roots, and was reduced to the necessity of hiring himself as a porter to a bookseller, who first of all discovered his skill in the Hebrew language, and made it known to his countrymen. The Dutch themselves, just emerged from civil and religious oppression, looked with a jealous eye on these suffering refugees. And though the civil power, commonly in every state more friendly than the ecclesiastic to toleration, does not appear to have oppressed them, the clergy would not afford them an opportunity to refute the unfavourable reports generally circulated against them, on the authority of letters from England; nor receive their confession of faith; nor give them an audience on some points, on which they desired to lay their sentiments before them. But with a man at their head, of no less eminence than James Arminius, judged that they ought to petition the magistrate for leave to hold their assemblies for the worship of God, and informed against them in such a way as might have rendered them the objects of suspicion. "They seemed evidently (it has been remarked) to have considered them in the same light, in which serious and conscientious dissenters from the religious profession of the majority will ever be viewed, as a set of discontented, factious, and converted men, with whom it would be safest for them to have no connexion." Ainsworth's two treatises on The Communion of Saints, and An Arrow against Idolatry, printed at Edinburgh, 1789, prof. p. 15—17.—Ed.

were the leaders. Mr. Johnson erected a church at Amsterdam, after the model of the Brownists, having the learned Mr. Ainsworth for doctor or teacher. These two published to the world a confession of faith of the people called Brownists, in the year 1602, not much different in doctrine from "The harmony of confessions;" but being men of warm spirits, they fell to pieces about points of discipline;* Johnson excommunicated his own father and brother for trifling matters, after having rejected the mediation of the presbytery of Amsterdam. This divided the congregation, insomuch that Mr. Ainsworth and half the congregation excommunicated Johnson, who after some time returned the same compliment to Ainsworth. At length the contest grew so hot, that Amsterdam could not hold them; Johnson and his followers removed to Embden, where soon after dying, his congregation dissolved. Nor did Mr. Ainsworth and his followers live long in peace, upon which he left them and retired to Ireland, where he continued some time; but when the spirits of his people were quieted he returned to

* A late writer, who appears to have accurately investigated the history of the Brownists, represents Mr. Neal as incorrect in his account of the debates which arose amongst them. The principal leaders of this party were the two brothers Francis and George Johnson, Mr. Ainsworth, and Mr. John Smith, who had been a clergyman in England. Three principal subjects of controversy occasioned dissensions in the Brownist churches. The first ground of dissension was the marriage of Francis Johnson with a widow of a taste for living and dress; particularly unsuitable to times of persecution; his father and his brother opposed this connexion. This occasioned such a difference, that the latter proceeded from admonitions and reproofs, to bitter revilings and reproaches: and Francis Johnson, his colleague Ainsworth, and the church, at length, passed a sentence of excommunication against the father and brother. Mr. Neal, it seems, confounds this unhappy controversy with another that succeeded to it, but distinct from it, between Francis Johnson and Ainsworth. It turned upon a question of discipline. The former placing the government of the church in the eldership alone, the latter in the church, of which the elders are a part. This dispute was carried to an unchristian length, but, according to Mr. John Cotton of New England, who was the contemporary of Johnson and Ainsworth, and had lived amidst the partisans of each side, they did not, as Mr. Neal represents the matter, mutually excommunicate each other; but Ainsworth and his company withdrew and worshipped by themselves after Johnson and those with him had denied the communion. In the interim of these debates, a schism had taken place in the church, headed by Mr. John Smith, who advanced and maintained opinions similar to those afterward espoused by Arminius; and besides his sentiments concerning baptism, to which Mr. Neal refers in the next paragraph, several singular opinions were ascribed to him: as, that no translation of the Bible could be properly the word of God, but the original only was so: that singing set words or verses to God was without any proper authority: that flight in time of persecution was unlawful: that the new creature needed not the support of Scriptures and ordinances, but is above them: that perfection is attainable in this life, &c. There arose against him a whole host of opponents; Johnson, Robinson, Clifton, Ainsworth, and Jessop. His character as well as his sentiments were attacked with a virulence of spirit and an abusive language, that discredit the charges and expose the spirit of the writers. See some account of Mr. Ainsworth, prefixed to a new edition of his two treatises, p. 27 – 42; and Crosb.'s History of English Baptists, vol. 1. p. 3. &c. and p. 265, &c. – Ed.

Amsterdam, and continued with them to the day of his death. This Mr. Ainsworth was author of an excellent little treatise, entitled, "An arrow against idolatry," and of a most learned commentary on the five books of Moses, by which he appears to have been a great master of the oriental languages and of Jewish antiquities. His death was sudden, and not without suspicion of violence; for it is reported, that having found a diamond of very great value in the streets of Amsterdam, he advertised it in print, and when the owner, who was a Jew, came to demand it, he offered him any acknowledgment he would desire; but Ainsworth, though poor, would accept of nothing but a conference with some of his rabbies upon the prophecies of the Old Testament relating to the Messias, which the other promised; but not having interest enough to obtain it, and Ainsworth being resolute, it is thought he was poisoned.* His congregation remained without a pastor for some years after his death, and then chose Mr. Canne, author of the marginal references to the Bible, and sundry other treatises.

Mr. Smith was a learned man, and of good abilities, but of an unsettled head, as appears by the preface to one of his books, in which he desires that his last writings may always be taken for his present judgment. He was for refining upon the Brownists' scheme, and at last declared for the principles of the Baptists; upon this he left Amsterdam, and settled with his disciples at Ley; where, being at a loss for a proper administrator of the ordinance of baptism, he plunged himself, and then performed the ceremony upon others, which gained him the name of a Se-Baptist.† He

* Others say, that he obtained this conference, and so confounded the Jews, that from pique and malice they in this manner put an end to his life. He died in 1622 or 1623, leaving an exemplary character for humility, sobriety, discretion, and unblamable virtue. See an account prefixed to his two treatises, p. 60, &c.—Ed.

† This is said on the authority of his opponents only, who, from the acrimony with which they wrote against him, it may be reasonably concluded, might be ready to take up a report against him upon slender evidence. His defences of himself and his opinions have not been, for many years, to be met with; but the large quotations from them in the writings of his opponents afforded not the least intimation, either in the way of concession or justification, of his having done such a thing; the contrary may be rather concluded from them. The first ground of his separation from the established church, was a dislike of its ceremonies and prescribed forms of prayer, he afterward doubted concerning the validity of baptism administered in a national church; this paved the way for his rejecting the baptism of infants altogether, and adopting immersion as the true and only meaning of the word baptism. His judgment on doctrinal points underwent similar changes. How is Mr. Neal has called him a man "of an unsettled head." This language seems to insinuate a reflection on Mr. Smith: whereas

afterward embraced the tenets of Arminius, and published certain conclusions upon those points in the year 1611, which Mr. Robinson answered; but Smith died soon after, and his congregation dissolved.

Mr. John Robinson was a Norfolk divine, beneficed about Yarmouth, where being often molested by the bishop's officers, and his friends almost ruined in the ecclesiastical courts, he removed to Leyden, and erected a congregation upon the model of the Brownists.* He set out upon the most rigid principles, but by conversing with Dr. Ames, and other learned men, he became more moderate; and though he always maintained the lawfulness and necessity of separating from those reformed churches among which he lived, yet he did not deny them to be true churches, and admittted their members to occasional communion, allowing his own to join with the Dutch churches in prayer and hearing the word, but not in the sacraments and discipline, which gained him the character of a semi-separatist; his words are these;† "We profess, before God and men, that we agree so entirely with the reformed Dutch churches in matters of religion, that we are willing to subscribe to all and every one of their articles, as they are set down in 'The harmony of confessions.'—We acknowledge these reformed churches for true and genuine; we hold communion with them as far as we can; those among us that understand the Dutch language frequent their sermons; and we administer the Lord's supper to such of their members as are known to us, and desire it occasionally." This Mr. Robinson was the father of the Independents.

---

it is an honour to any man; it shews candour, ingenuousness, an openness to conviction, and sincerity, for one to change his sentiments on farther inquiry, and to avow it. A lover of truth, especially who has imbibed in early life the principles of the corrupt establishments of Christianity, will continually find it his duty to recede from his first sentiments. Bishop Tillotson justly commended his friend Dr. Whichcot; because, while it is customary with learned men at a certain age to *make their understandings*, the doctor was so wise as to be willing to learn to the last; *i. e.* he was of an unsettled head. Crosby's History of the English Baptists, vol. 1. p. 65, &c. Account of Mr. Ainsworth prefixed to his two treatises, p. 41.—Ed.

* Bayle's Dissuasive, p. 177.

† "Profitemur coram Deo et hominibus adeo nobis convenire cum ecclesiis reformatis Belgicis in re religionis ut omnibus et singulis earundem ecclesiarum fidei articulis, prout habentur in harmonia confessionum fidei, parati sumus subscribere.—Ecclesias reformatas pro veris et genuinis habemus, cum iisdem *in* sacris Dei communionem profitemur, et quantum in nobis est, colimus. Conciones publicas ab illarum pastoribus habitas, ex nostris qui norunt linguam Belgicam frequentant: sacram cœnam earum membris, si qua forte nostris cœtibus interesse nobis cognita, participamus."

Mr. Henry Jacob was born in Kent, and educated in St. Mary hall, where he took the degrees in arts, entered into holy orders, and became precentor of Christ-church college, and afterward beneficed in his own country at Cheriton.* He was a person thoroughly versed in theological authors, but withal a most zealous Puritan. He wrote two treatises aganst Fr. Johnson the Brownist, in defence of the church of England's being a true church, printed at Middleburgh, 1599, and afterward published "Reasons taken out of God's word, and the best human testimonies, proving a necessity of reforming our churches of England,&c. 1604."† But going to Leyden, and conversing with Mr. Robinson, he embraced his sentiments of discipline and government, and transplanted it into England in the year 1616, as will be seen in its proper place.

This difference among the Puritans engaged them in a warm controversy among themselves, about the lawfulness and necessity of separating from the church of England, while the conforming clergy stood by as spectators of the combat. Most of the Puritans were for keeping within the pale of the church, apprehending it to be a true church in its doctrines and sacraments, though defective in discipline, and corrupt in ceremonies; but being a true church they thought it not lawful to separate, though they could hardly continue in it with a good conscience. They submitted to suspensions and deprivations; and when they were driven out of one diocess, took sanctuary in another, being afraid of incurring the guilt of schism by forming themselves into separate communions. Whereas the Brownists maintained, that the church of England, in its present constitution, was no true church of Christ, but a limb of antichrist, or at best a mere creature of the state; that their ministers were not rightly called and ordained, nor the sacraments duly administered; or, supposing it to be a true church, yet as it was owned by their adversaries [the conforming Puritans] to be a very corrupt one; it must be as lawful to separate from it, as for the church of England to separate from Rome. The conforming Puritans evaded this consequence, by denying the church of Rome to be a true church; nay, they affirmed it to be the very antichrist; but the argument remained in full force against the bishops, and that part of

* Life of Whitgift, p. 566. † Ath. Ox. vol. 1. p. 394.

the clergy who acknowledged the church of Rome to be a true church.

It is certainly as lawful to separate from the corruptions of one church as of another; and it is necessary to do so, when those corruptions are imposed as terms of communion. Let us hear archbishop Laud, in his conference with the Jesuit Fisher. "Another church (says his grace) may separate from Rome, if Rome will separate from Christ; and so far as it separates from him, and the faith, so far may another church separate from it. I grant the church of Rome to be a true church in essence, though corrupt in manners and doctrine. And corruption of manners, attended with errors in the doctrines of faith, is a just cause for one particular church to separate from another." His grace then adds, with regard to the church of Rome; "The cause of the separation is yours, for you thrust us from you, because we called for truth and redress of abuses; for a schism must needs be theirs whose the cause of it is; the woe runs full out of the mouth of Christ, even against him that gives the offence, not against him that takes it. It was ill done of those, whoever they were, who first made the separation [from Rome]; I mean not actual but casual, for, as I said before, the schism is theirs whose the cause of it is; and he makes the separation who gives the first just cause of it, not he that makes an actual separation upon a just cause preceding." Let the reader carefully consider these concessions, and then judge how far they will justify the separation of the Brownists, or the Protestant Nonconformists at this day.

This year [1605] was famous for the discovery of the gunpowder plot, which was a contrivance of the Papists to blow up the king and the whole royal family, with the chief of the Protestant nobility and gentry, November 5th, the first day of their assembling in parliament. For this purpose a cellar was hired under the house of lords, and stored with thirty-six barrels of gunpowder, covered over with coals and faggots; but the plot was discovered the night before, by means of a letter sent to Lord Monteagle, advising him to absent himself from the house, because they were to receive a terrible blow, and not to know who hurt them. Monteagle carrying the letter to court, the king ordered the apartments about the parliament-house to be searched; the

powder was found under the house of lords, and Guy Faux with a dark lantern in the cellar, waiting to set fire to the train when the king should come to the house the next morning. Faux being apprehended confessed the plot, and impeached several of his accomplices, eight of whom were tried and executed, and among them Garnet, provincial of the English Jesuits, whom the pope afterward canonized.

The discovery of this murderous conspiracy was ascribed to the royal penetration;* but Mr. Osborne† and others, with great probability say, that the first notice of it came from Henry IV. king of France, who heard of it from the Jesuits; and, that the letter to Monteagle was an artifice of Cecil's, who was acquainted beforehand with the proceedings of the conspirators, and suffered them to go to their full length. Even Heylin says, that the king and his council mined with them, and undermined them, and by so doing blew up their whole invention.‡ But it is agreed on all hands, that if the plot had taken place it was to have been fathered upon the Puritans; and, as if the king was in the secret, his majesty in his speech to the parliament, November 9th, takes particular care to bring them into reproach; for after having cleared the Roman-Catholic religion from encouraging such murderous practices, he adds, the cruelty of the Puritans was worthy of fire, that would not allow salvation to any Papists. So that if these unhappy people had been blown up, his majesty thinks they would have had their deserts. Strange! that a Puritan should be so much worse than a Papist, or deserve to be burnt for uncharitableness, when his majesty knew, that the Papists were so much more criminal in this respect than they, not only denying salvation to the Puritans, but to all who are without the pale of their own church. But what was all this to the plot? except it was to turn off the indignation of the people from the Papists, whom the king both feared and loved, to the Puritans, who in a course of forty years' sufferings had never moved the least sedition against the state, but who would not be the advocates or dupes of an unbounded prerogative!

The discovery of this plot occasioned the drawing up the oath of allegiance, or of submission and obedience to the king as a temporal sovereign independent of any other power upon earth; which quickly passed both houses, and was ap-

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 171. † Osborne, p. 458. ‡ History of Presbytery, p. 378.

pointed to be taken by all the king's subjects; this oath is distinct from the oath of supremacy, which obliges the subject to acknowledge his majesty to be supreme head of the church as well as the state, and might therefore be taken by all such Roman Catholics as did not believe the pope had power to depose kings, and give away their dominions. Accordingly Blackwell their superior, and most of the English Catholics, submitted to the oath, though the pope absolutely forbade them on pain of damnation; which occasioned a new debate, concerning the extent of the pope's power in temporals, between the learned of both religions. Cardinal Bellarmine, under the feigned name of Tortus, wrote against the oath, which gave occasion to king James's Apology to all Christian princes; wherein, after clearing himself from the charge of persecuting the Papists, he reproaches his holiness with ingratitude, considering the free liberty of religion that he had granted the Papists, the honours he had conferred on them, the free access they had to his person at all times; the general jail delivery of all Jesuits and Papists convict, and the strict orders he had given his judges not to put the laws in execution against them for the future.* All which was true, while the unhappy Puritans were imprisoned and fined, or forced into banishment. The parliament, on occasion of this plot appointed an annual thanksgiving on the 5th of November, and passed another law, obliging all persons to come to church under the penalty of twelvepence every Sunday they were absent, unless they gave such reasons as should be satisfactory to a justice of peace. This, like a two-edged sword, cut down all separatists, whether Protestants or Papists.

To return to the Puritans; the more moderate of whom, being willing to steer a middle course, between a total separation and absolute conformity, were attacked by some of the bishops with this argument:

"All those who wilfully refuse to obey the king in all things indifferent, and to conform themselves to the orders of the church authorized by him, not contrary to the word of God, are schismatics, enemies to the king's supremacy, and the state, and not to be tolerated in church or commonwealth.

"But you do so——

* King James's Apol. p. 203.

"Therefore you are not to be tolerated in church or commonwealth."

The Puritans denied the charge, and returned this argument upon their accusers:

"All those who freely and willingly perform to the king and state all obedience, not only in things necessary, but indifferent, commanded by law, and that have been always ready to conform themselves to every order of the church authorized by him, not contrary to the word of God, are free from all schism, friends to the king's supremacy, and to the state, and unworthy in this manner to be molested in church or commonwealth.

"But there are none of us that are deprived or suspended from our ministry, but have been ever ready to do all this; therefore we are free from schism, friends to the king's supremacy, and most unworthy of such molestation as we sustain."

This being the point of difference, the Puritans offered a public disputation upon the lawfulness of imposing ceremonies in general; and in particular upon the surplice, the cross in baptism, and kneeling at the communion; but were refused. Upon which the Lincolnshire ministers drew up an apology for those ministers who are troubled for refusing of subscription and conformity, and presented it to the king, December 1, 1604, the abridgment of which is now before me, and begins with a declaration of their readiness to subscribe the first of the three articles required by the thirty-sixth canon, concerning the king's supremacy; but to the other two, say they, we cannonst bscribe, because we are persuaded, that both the Book of Common Prayer, and the other book [of articles] to be subscribed by this canon (which yet, in some respects, we reverently esteem) contain in them sundry things which are not agreeable, but contrary to, the word of God.

They object to the Book of Common Prayer in general, That it appoints that order for reading the Holy Scriptures, which in many respects is contrary to the word of God. As,

1. "The greatest part of the canonical Scripture is left out in the public reading; whereas 'all Scripture is given by inspiration, and is profitable,' &c. and sundry chapters that are, in their opinion, more edifying than some others that are read, are omitted——.

2. "It does too much honour to the Apocryphal writings, commanding many of them to be read for first lessons, and under the name of Holy Scripture, and in as great a proportion; for of the canonical chapters of the Old Testament (being in all seven hundred and seventy-nine) are read only five hundred and ninety-two, and of the Apocryphal books (being one hundred and seventy-two chapters) are read one hundred and four. This they apprehend to be contrary to the word of God, forasmuch as the Apocryphal books contain sundry and manifest errors, divers of which are here produced.

3, 4, 5, 6, 7. "The Book of Common Prayer appoints such a translation of the Holy Scriptures to be read in the churches as in some places is absurd, and in others takes from, perverts, obscures, and falsifies, the word of God; examples of which are produced, with the authorities of the most considerable reformers."

Their next general objection against subscribing the Book of Common Prayer is, because it enjoins the use of such ceremonies as they apprehend contrary to the word of God.

To make good this assertion they say,* "It is contrary to the word of God to use (much more to command the use of) such ceremonies in the worship of God, as man hath devised, if they be notoriously known to be abused to idolatry and superstition by the Papists, and are of no necessary use in the church. Here they cite such passages of Scripture as command the Jews to abolish all instruments of idolatry; and even to cast away such things as had a good original, when once they are known to have been abused to idolatry; as, images, groves, and the brazen serpent: 2 Kings xviii. 11. They produce farther the testimonies of sundry fathers, as, Eusebius, St. Austin, &c. and of the most considerable moderns, as, Calvin, Bucer, Musculus, Peter Martyr, Beza, Zanchy; bishop Jewel, Pilkington, Bilson; Dr. Humphrys, Fulk, Andrews, Sutcliffe, and others, against conformity with idolaters."

With regard to the three ceremonies in question, they allege, they have all been abused by the Papists to superstition and idolatry.

1. "The surplice† has been thus abused, for 'tis one of

*Abridgment, p. 17. † Ibid. p. 28.

those vestments without which nothing can be consecrated; all priests that are present at mass must wear it, and therefore the use of it in the church has been condemned, not only by foreign divines, but by bishop Hooper, Farrar, Jewel, Pilkington, Rogers, and others among ourselves."

2. "The cross has been also abused to superstition and idolatry, to drive away devils, to expel diseases, to break the force of witchcraft, &c. It is one of the images to which the Papists give religious adoration. The water in baptism has no spiritual virtue in it without the cross, nor is any one rightly baptized (according to the Papists) without it."

3. "Kneeling at the sacrament has been no less abused; it arose from the notion of the transubstantiation of the elements, and is still used by the Papists in the worship of their breaden God; who admit they should be guilty of idolatry in kneeling before the elements, if they did not believe them to be the real body and blood of Christ. This ceremony was not introduced into the church till antichrist was at his full height; and there is no action in the whole service that looks so much like idolatry as this."

Their second argument* for the unlawfulness of the ceremonies, is taken from their mystical signification, which gives them the nature of a sacrament. Now, no sacrament ought to be of man's devising; the ceremonies therefore, being affirmed in the Book of Common Prayer to be significant, are unlawful.

Their third argument† is taken from the unlawfulness of imposing them as parts of God's worship, which they prove from hence, "that God is the only appointer of his own worship, and condemns all human inventions, so far forth as they are made parts of it. Now all the ceremonies in question are thus imposed; for divine service is supposed not to be rightly performed without the surplice, nor baptism rightly administered without the cross, nor the Lord's supper but to such as kneel; and therefore they are unlawful."

Their fourth is taken from hence, That no rites or ecclesiastical orders should be ordained or used, but such as are needful and profitable, and for edification; and especially, that none should be ordained or used that cause offence, and hinder edification,‡ (Rom. xiv. 21. 1 Cor. x. 23. 32.) "Now

* Abridgment, p. 31. † Ibid. p. 37. ‡ Ibid. p. 45.

the ceremonies in question are neither needful nor profitable, nor do they tend to edification; but, on the contrary, have given great offence, as appears from hence, that very many of the learned and best experienced ministers in the land have chosen rather to suffer any trouble than yield to the use of them; and we doubt not to affirm, that the greatest number of resident, able, and godly ministers in the land at this day, do in their consciences dislike them, and judge them needless and unfit; as appears by the list of nonsubscribers already mentioned [p. 44], besides many more, who, though unwilling in some other respects to join in the petition, did profess their hearty desire to have them removed.* And if the rest of the shires be esteemed according to this proportion, it will easily appear, that the greatest number of the resident, preaching, and fruitful ministers of the land do dislike them. This may yet farther appear, by their seldom using them for many years past, and their great unwillingness to yield to the use of them now. If they thought them needful or profitable, why do they neglect them in their public ministry, being commanded by lawful authority? Besides, those very bishops that have been most hot in urging the ceremonies, have declared, that the church might well be without them, and have wished them taken away; as, archbishop Whitgift, in his defence of the answer to Cartwright's Admonition, p. 259; Dr. Chadderton, bishop of Lincoln, in his speech before all the ministers, convened before him at Huntingdon, November 30th, 1604, and others in ecclesiastical dignities have spoken vehemently against them, as things that do not edify, nor have any tendency to promote decency or order.

"With regard to the surplice, they produce the testimonies of the learned Bucer, Peter Martyr, Beza, Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, and others, for the inexpediency of it, even though they submitted to wear it. Bucer says, he could be content to suffer some grievous loss or pain in his body, upon condition the surplice might be abolished.

"The like authorities are brought against the cross, and against kneeling at the communion, the former being a mere invention of man, neither taught by Christ nor his apostles, and the latter being apparently different from the first in-

* Abridgment, p. 53.

stitution, they receiving it in a table-posture; and it is gross hypocrisy (say they) for us to pretend more holiness, reverence, and devotion, in receiving the sacrament, than the apostles, who received it from the immediate hand and person of Christ himself. They (to be sure) had the corporal presence of Christ, and yet did not kneel; why then should it be enjoined the church, when the corporal presence of Christ is withdrawn? This has been thought an argument of great force by our chief divines, as, Calvin, Bullinger, Beza, Chemnitius, bishop Pilkington, Willet, and others, who declare strongly for the posture of sitting, or at most standing, at the communion.

"Besides, kneeling at the sacrament is of very late antiquity, and was not introduced into the church till antichrist was in his full height; the primitive Christians (according to Tertullian) thought it unlawful to kneel at prayer on the Lord's day; and the first council of Nice, ann. Dom. 327, made a solemn decree, that none might pray kneeling, but only standing, on the Lord's day, because on that day is celebrated the joyful remembrance of our Lord's resurrection. To kneel is a gesture of sorrow and humiliation; whereas he that prays standing shews himself thankful for the obtaining some mercy or favour. So that either the primitive church used a gesture of greater reverence and humility at the sacrament, which is a feast, and a joyful remembrance of the death of Christ, than they did at prayer, or else they received it in another posture. Besides, it is said,* that the ancient councils commanded, that 'no man should kneel down at the communion, fearing it should be an occasion of idolatry.' Mr. Fox,† speaking of the usage of the primitive church, says, they had the communion not at an altar, but at a plain table of boards, when the whole congregation together did communicate, with reverence and thanksgiving; not lifting over the priest's head, nor worshipping, nor kneeling, nor knocking their breasts, but either sitting at supper, or standing after supper. Eusebius,‡ speaking of a man that had been admitted to the communion, says, he stood at the table, and put forth his hand to receive the holy food. And bishop Jewel says, that in St. Basil's days [ann. 380] the communion-table was of boards, and so placed, that men might stand round it, and that every man

* Abridgment, p. 59. † Acts and Mon. p. 19. ‡ Hist. Eccl. lib. 7. cap. 8.

was bound by an apostolical tradition to stand upright at the communion.

"Besides, the gesture of kneeling is contrary to the very nature of the Lord's supper, which is ordained to be a banquet and sign of that sweet familiarity that is between the faithful and him, and of that spiritual nourishment we are to receive by feeding on his body and blood by faith; and in what nation is it thought decent to kneel at banquets? Where do men eat and drink upon their knees? Farther, the disposition of mind at the Lord's table is not so much humility, as assurance of faith, and cheerful thankfulness for the benefits of Christ's death. For these reasons, and because kneeling at the sacrament had an idolatrous original, and has a tendency to lead men into that sin, they think it unlawful, and to be laid aside."

The Abridgment concludes with a short table of sundry other exceptions against the three books whereunto they are required to subscribe, which they purpose to justify and confirm in the same manner as they have done in respect of those contained in this book; a summary whereof we shall meet with hereafter.

The Abridgment was answered by bishop Moreton and Dr. Burges, who, after having suffered himself to be deprived for nonconformity, June 19, 1604, was persuaded by king James to conform, and write in defence of his present conduct against his former arguments. Bishop Moreton endeavours to defend the innocency of the three ceremonies from Scripture, antiquity, the testimony of Protestant divines, and the practice of the Nonconformists themselves in other cases, and has said as much as can be said in favour of them; though it is hard to defend the imposing them upon those who esteem them unlawful, or who apprehend things indifferent ought to be left in the state that Christ left them. Dr. Downham, Sparkes, Covel, Hutton, Rogers, and Ball, wrote for the ceremonies; and were answered by Mr. Bradshaw, Mr. Paul Baynes, Dr. Ames, and others.

From the arguments of these divines it appears, that the Puritans were removing to a greater distance from the church; for whereas, says Dr. Burges, Mr. Cartwright and his brethren wrote sharply against the ceremonies as inconvenient, now they are opposed as absolutely unlawful,

neither to be imposed nor used. The cruel severities of Bancroft and the high commissioners were the occasion of this; for being pushed upon one of these extremes, either to a constant and full conformity, or to lay down their ministry in the church, many of them, at one of their conferences, came to this conclusion, that if they could not enjoy their livings without subscribing over again the three articles above mentioned, and declaring at the same time, they did it willingly and from their hearts, it was their duty to resign. These were called brethren of the second separation, who were content to join with the church in her doctrines and sacraments, though they apprehended it unlawful to declare their hearty approbation of the ceremonies; and if their conduct was grounded on a conviction that it was their duty as Christians to bear their testimony against all unscriptural impositions in the worship of God, it must deserve the commendation of all impartial and consistent Protestants. No men could go greater lengths for the sake of peace than they were willing to do; for in their defence of the ministers' reasons for refusal of subscription to the Book of Common Prayer against the cavils of F. Hutton, B. D. Dr. Covel, and Dr. Sparkes, published 1607, they begin thus, "We protest before the Almighty God, that we acknowledge the churches of England as they be established by public authority, to be true visible churches of Christ; that we desire the continuance of our ministry in them above all earthly things, as that without which our whole life would be wearisome and bitter to us; that we dislike not a set form of prayer to be used in our churches; nor do we write with an evil mind to deprave the Book of Common Prayer, ordination, or book of homilies; but to shew our reasons why we cannot subscribe to all things contained in them."

These extreme proceedings of the bishops strengthened the hands of the Brownists in Holland, who with great advantage declared against the lawfulness of holding communion with the church of England at that time, not only because it was a corrupt church, but a persecuting one. On the other hand, the younger divines in the church, who preached for preferment, painted the separatists in the most odious colours, as, heretics, schismatics, fanatics, precisians,

enemies to God and the king, and of unstable minds. The very same language which the Papists had used against the first reformers.

To remove these reproaches, and to inform the world of the real principles of the Puritans of these times, the reverend M. Bradshaw published a small treatise, entitled, "English Puritanism, containing the main opinions of the rigidest sort of those that went by that name in the realm of England," which the learned Dr. Ames translated into Latin for the benefit of foreigners. The reader will learn by the following abstract of it, the true state of their case, as well as the near affinity between the principles of the ancient and modern Nonconformists.*

CHAP. I.

Concerning Religion in general.

"The Puritans hold and maintain the absolute perfection of the Holy Scriptures, both as to faith and worship; and that whatsoever is enjoined as a part of divine service, that cannot be warranted by the said Scriptures, is unlawful.

2. "That all inventions of men, especially such as have been abused to idolatry, are to be excluded out of the exercises of religion.

3. "That all outward means instituted to express and set forth the inward worship of God, are parts of divine worship, and ought therefore evidently to be prescribed by the word of God.

4. "To institute and ordain any mystical rites or ceremonies of religion, and to mingle the same with the divine rites and ceremonies of God's ordinance, is gross superstition."

CHAP. II.

Concerning the Church.

1. "They hold and maintain, that every congregation or assembly of men, ordinarily joining together in the true worship of God, is a true visible church of Christ.

2. "That all such churches are in all ecclesiastical matters equal, and by the word of God ought to have the same officers, administrations, orders, and forms of worship.

* Several things, considered as remarkable by Dr. Grey, are omitted by Mr Neal. But this doth not impeach Mr. Neal's fairness, as he avowedly lays only an abstract before his readers, and the passages, to which Dr. Grey alludes, do not convey sentiments repugnant to the principles exhibited in the above abstract.—Ed.

3. "That Christ has not subjected any church or congregation to any other superior ecclesiastical jurisdiction than to that which is within itself, so that if a whole church or congregation should err in any matters of faith or worship, no other churches or spiritual officers, have power to censure or punish them, but are only to counsel and advise them.

4. "That every church ought to have her own spiritual officers and ministers resident with her; and those such as are enjoined by Christ in the New Testament, and no other.

5. "That every church ought to have liberty to choose their own spiritual officers.

6. "That if particular churches err in this choice, none but the civil magistrate has power to control them, and oblige them to make a better choice.

7. "That ecclesiastical officers or ministers in one church ought not to bear any ecclesiastical office in another; and they are not to forsake their calling without just cause, and such as may be approved by the congregation; but if the congregation will not hearken to reason, they are then to appeal to the civil magistrate, who is bound to procure them justice.

8. "That a church having chosen its spiritual governors, ought to live in all canonical obedience to them, agreeable to the word of God; and if any of them be suspended, or unjustly deprived, by other ecclesiastical officers, they are humbly to pray the magistrate to restore them; and if they cannot obtain it, they are to own them to be their spiritual guides to the death, though they are rigorously deprived of their ministry and service.

9. "That the laws and orders of the churches warranted by the word of God are not repugnant to civil government, whether monarchical, aristocratical, or democratical; and we renounce all jurisdiction that is repugnant or derogatory to any of these, especially to the monarchy of this kingdom."

CHAP. III.

Concerning the Ministers of the Word.

1. "They hold that the pastors of particular congregations are the highest spiritual officers in the church, over

whom there is no superior pastor by divine appointment bu Jesus Christ.

2. "That there are not by divine institution, in the word, any ordinary, national, provincial, or diocesan pastors, to whom the pastors of particular churches are to be subject.

3. "That no pastor ought to exercise or accept of any civil jurisdiction or authority, but ought to be wholly employed in spiritual offices and duties to that congregation over which he is set.

4. "That the supreme office of the pastor is to preach the word publicly to the congregation; and that the people of God ought not to acknowledge any for their pastors that are not able by preaching to interpret and apply the word of God to them; and consequently all ignorant, and mere reading priests, are to be rejected.

5. "That in public worship the pastor only is to be the mouth of the congregation to God in prayer; and that the people are only to testify their assent by the word *Amen*.

6. "That the church has no power to impose upon her pastors or officers, any other ceremonies or injunctions than what Christ has appointed.

7. "That in every church there should also be a doctor to instruct and catechise the ignorant in the main principles of religion."

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the Elders.

1. "They hold, that by God's ordinance the congregation should choose other officers as assistants to the ministers in the government of the church, who are jointly with the ministers to be overseers of the manners and conversation of all the congregation.

2. "That these are to be chosen out of the gravest, and most discreet members, who are also of some note in the world, and able, if possible, to maintain themselves."

CHAP. V.

Of Church Censures.

1. "They hold that the spiritual keys of the church are committed to the aforesaid spiritual officers and governors, and to none others.

2. "That by virtue of these keys they are not to examine

and make inquisition into the hearts of men, nor molest them upon private suspicions, or uncertain fame, but to proceed only upon open and notorious crimes. If the offender be convinced, they ought not to scorn, deride, taunt, and revile him with contumelious language, nor procure proctors to make personal invectives against him; nor make him give attendance from term to term, and from one court-day to another, of the manner of our ecclesiastical courts; but to use him brotherly, and if possible to move him to repentance; and if he repent they are not to proceed to censure, but to accept his hearty sorrow and contrition as a sufficient satisfaction to the church, without imposing any fines, or taking fees, or enjoining any outward mark of shame, as the white sheet, &c.

"But if the offender be obstinate, and shew no signs of repentance, and if his crime be fully proved upon him, and be of such a high nature as to deserve a censure according to the word of God, then the ecclesiastical officers, with the free consent of the whole congregation (and not otherwise), are first to suspend him from the sacrament, praying for him at the same time, that God would give him repentance to the acknowledgment of his fault; and if this does not humble him, they are then to denounce him to be as yet no member of the kingdom of heaven, and of that congregation; and so are to leave him to God and the king. And this is all the ecclesiastical jurisdiction that any spiritual officers are to use against any man for the greatest crime that can be committed.

"If the party offending be a civil superior, they are to behave towards him with all that reverence and civil subjection that his honour or high office in the state may require. They are not to presume to convene him before them, but are themselves to go to him in all civil and humble manner, to stand bareheaded, to bow, to give him all his civil titles; and if it be a supreme governor or king, to kneel, and in most humble manner to acquaint him with his faults; and if such or any other offenders will voluntarily withdraw from the communion, they have no farther concern with them.

"They hold the oath *ex officio* on the imposer's part to be most damnable and tyrannous, against the very law of nature, devised by antichrist, through the inspiration of the

devil, to tempt weak Christians to perjure themselves, or be drawn in to reveal to the enemies of Christianity those secret religious acts, which, though done for the advancement of the gospel, may bring on themselves and their dearest friends heavy sentences of condemnation from the court."

CHAP. VI.

Concerning the Civil Magistrate.

1. "They hold, that the civil magistrate ought to have supreme civil* power over all the churches within his dominions; but that, as he is a Christian, he ought to be a member of some one of them; which is not in the least derogatory to his civil supremacy.

2. "That all ecclesiastical officers are punishable by the civil magistrate, for the abuse of their ecclesiastical offices; and much more if they intrude upon the rights and prerogatives of the civil authority.

3. "They hold the pope to be antichrist, because he usurps the supremacy over kings and princes; and therefore all that defend the Popish faith, and that are for tolerating that religion, are secret enemies of the king's supremacy.

4. "That all archbishops, bishops, deans, officials, &c. hold their offices and functions at the king's will and pleasure, merely *jure humano*; and whosoever holdeth that the king may not remove them, and dispose of them at his pleasure, is an enemy to his supremacy."

Let the reader now judge, whether there was sufficient ground for the calumny and reproach that were cast upon the Puritans of these times: but their adversaries having often charged them with denying the supremacy, and with claiming a sort of jurisdiction over the king himself, they published another pamphlet this summer, entitled, "A protestation of the king's supremacy, made in the name of the afflicted ministers, and opposed to the shameful calumniations of the prelates." To which was annexed, an humble petition for liberty of conscience. In their protestation they declare,

1. "We hold and maintain the king's supremacy in all

* Dr. Grey says, that the word *civil* is added by M. Neal, and that he has omitted, after "dominions," the clause "in all cases whatsoever."—Ed.

causes, and over all persons civil and ecclesiastical, as it was granted to queen Elizabeth, and explained in the book of injunctions; nor have any of us been unwilling to subscribe and swear to it. We believe it to be the king's natural right without a statute law, and that the churches within his dominions would sin damnably if they did not yield it to him. Nay, we believe, that the king cannot alienate it from his crown, or transfer it to any spiritual potentates or rulers; and that it is not tied to his faith or Christianity, but to his very crown; so that if he were an infidel the supremacy is his due.

2. "We hold, that no church-officers have power to deprive the king of any branch of his royal prerogative, much less of his supremacy, which is inseparable from him.

3. "That no ecclesiastical officers have power over the bodies, lives, goods, or liberties, of any persons within the king's dominions.

4. "That the king may make laws for the good ordering of the churches within his dominions; and that the churches ought not to be disobedient, unless they apprehend them contrary to the word of God; and even in such case they are not to resist, but peaceably to forbear obedience, and submit to the punishment, if mercy cannot be obtained.

5. "That the king only hath power, within his dominions, to convene synods or general assemblies of ministers, and by his authority royal to ratify and give life to their canons and constitutions, without whose ratification no man can force any subject to yield obedience to the same.

6. "That the king ought not to be subject to the censures of any churches, church-officers, or synods, whatsoever; but only to that church, and those officers of his own court and household, with whom he shall voluntarily join in communion, where there can be no fear of unjust usage.

7. "If a king, after he has held communion with a Christian church, should turn apostate, or live in a course of open defiance to the laws of God and religion, the church-governors are to give over their spiritual charge and tuition of him, which by calling from God and the king, they did undertake; and more than this they may not do, for the king still retains his supreme authority over the churches as entirely, and in as ample a manner, as if he were the most Christian prince in the world.

8. "We refuse no obedience to the king, nor to any of the canons required by the prelates, but such as we are willing to take upon our consciences, and to swear, if required, that we believe contrary to the word of God. We deny no ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the king but that which Christ has appropriated to himself, who is the sole doctor and legislator of his church.

9. "We are so far from claiming any supremacy to ourselves, that we exclude from ourselves all secular pomp and power, holding it a sin to punish men in their bodies, goods, liberties, or lives, for any merely spiritual offence.

10. "We confine all ecclesiastical jurisdiction within one congregation, and that jurisdiction is not alone in the ministers, but also in the elders of the church; and their jurisdiction is merely spiritual.

"Therefore all that we crave of his majesty and the state is, that, with his and their permission, it may be lawful for us to worship God according to his revealed will; and that we may not be forced to the observance of any human rites and ceremonies. We are ready to make an open confession of our faith, and form of worship, and desire that we may not be obliged to worship God in corners, but that our religious and civil behaviour may be open to the observation and censure of the civil government, to whom we profess all due subjection. So long as it shall please the king and parliament to maintain the hierarchy or prelacy in this kingdom, we are content that they enjoy their state and dignity; and we will live as brethren among those ministers that acknowledge spiritual homage to their spiritual lordships, paying to them all temporal duties of tithes, &c. and joining with them in the service and worship of God, so far as we may, without our own particular communicating in those human traditions which we judge unlawful. Only we pray, that the prelates and their ecclesiastical officers may not be our judges, but that we may both of us stand at the bar of the civil magistrate, and that if we shall be openly vilified and slandered, it may be lawful for us, without fear of punishment, to justify ourselves to the world; and then we shall think our lives, and all that we have, too little to spend in the service of our king and country."

Though the principles of submission are here laid down with great latitude, and though the practice of the Puritans

was agreeable to them, yet their enemies did not fail to charge them with disloyalty, with sedition, and with disturbing the peace of the state. Upon which the ministers of Devon and Cornwall published another small treatise, entitled, "A removal of certain imputations laid upon the ministers," &c. in which they say, p. 21, "Let them [the bishops] sift well our courses since his majesty's happy entrance in among us, and let them name wherein we have done aught that may justly be said ill to become the ministers of Jesus Christ. Have we drawn any sword? have we raised any tumult? have we used any threats? hath the state been put into any fear or hazard through us? manifold disgraces have been cast upon us, and we have endured them; the liberty of our ministry hath been taken from us, and (though with bleeding hearts) we have sustained it. We have been cast out of our houses, and deprived of our ordinary maintenance; yet have we blown no trumpet of sedition. These things have gone very near us, and yet did we never so much as entertain a thought of violence. The truth is, we have petitioned the king and state; and who hath reason to deny us that liberty? we have craved of the prelates to deal with us according to law; and is not this the common benefit of every subject? we have besought them to convince our consciences by Scripture:—Alas! what would they have us to do? will they have us content ourselves with this only, that they are bishops, and therefore for their greatness ought to be yielded to? the weight of episcopal power may oppress us, but cannot convince us."*

It appears from hence, that the Puritans were the king's faithful subjects; that they complied to the utmost limit of their consciences, and that when they could not obey, they were content to suffer. Here are no principles inconsistent with the public safety; no marks of heresy, impiety, or sedition; no charges of ignorance, or neglect of duty; how unreasonable then must it be, to silence and deprive such men? to shut them up in prison, or send them with their families a begging, while their pulpit-doors were to be shut up, and there was a famine in many parts of the country, not of bread, but of the word of the Lord;† yet these ho-

* Episcoporum auctoritas opprimere nos potest, docere non potest.—Ed.

† Rapin, vol. 2. p. 176, 185. folio edit.

nest men were not only persecuted at home, but restrained from retiring into his majesty's dominions abroad; for when the ecclesiastical courts had driven them from their habitations and livelihoods, and were still hunting them by their informers from one end of the land to the other, several families crossed the ocean to Virginia, and invited their friends to follow; but Bancroft being informed that great numbers were preparing to embark, obtained a proclamation prohibiting them to transport themselves to Virginia, without a special licence from the king; a severity hardly to be paralleled! nor was it ever imitated in this country except by archbishop Laud.

The isles of Guernsey and Jersey having enjoyed the discipline of the French churches without disturbance, all the reign of queen Elizabeth, upon the accession of the present king, addressed his majesty for a confirmation of it;* which he was pleased to grant by a letter under the privy seal, in these words;

"Whereas we have been given to understand, that our dear sister queen Elizabeth did permit and allow to the isles of Jersey and Guernsey, parcels of the dutchy of Normandy, the use of the government of the reformed churches of the said dutchy, whereof they have stood possessed till our coming to the crown; for this cause, as well as for the edification of the church, we do will and ordain, that our said isles shall quietly enjoy their said liberty in the use of ecclesiastical discipline there now established; forbidding any one to give them any trouble or impeachment, so long as they contain themselves in our obedience.

"Given at Hampton-court, August 8th, in the first year of our reign, 1603."

But Bancroft and some of his brethren the bishops, hav-

* Dr. Grey quotes here Collyer's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2. p. 705, in contradiction to Mr. Neal, and to charge the Puritans as "addressing king James with a false suggestion, that the discipline had been allowed by queen Elizabeth." Dr. Grey's stricture would have been superseded, if he had attended to Mr. Neal's state of the business, who says only, that "the discipline of the French churches had been enjoyed without disturbance all the reign of queen Elizabeth;" without asserting whether this indulgence were owing to connivance, or to an express grant. Heylin, however says, that the "Genevian discipline had been settled by queen Elizabeth" Hist. of Presb. p. 395. And Collyer himself owns, that though the queen allowed only one church to adopt the model of Geneva, and enjoined the use of the English liturgy in all others; yet it was soon laid aside by all the churches, and the Geneva plan adopted by the decree of synods, held under the countenance of the governors of Guernsey and the neighbouring isles. These authorities fully justify Mr. Neal's representation.—Ed.

ing possessed the king with the necessity of a general uniformity throughout all his dominions, these islands were to be included; accordingly sir John Peyton, a zealous churchman; was appointed governor with secret instructions to root out the Geneva discipline, and plant the English liturgy and ceremonies.* This gentleman, taking advantage of the synod's appointing a minister to a vacant living, according to custom, protested against it, as injurious to the king's prerogative, and complained to court, that the Jersey ministers had usurped the patronage of the benefices of the island; that they had admitted men to livings without the form of presentation, which was a loss to the crown in its first-fruits; that by the connivance or allowance of former governors they exercised a kind of arbitrary jurisdiction; and therefore prayed that his majesty would settle the English discipline among them.† The Jersey ministers alleged in their own defence, that the presentation to livings was a branch of their discipline; and that the payments of first-fruits and tenths had never been demanded since they were disengaged from the see of Constance. They pleaded his majesty's royal confirmation of their discipline, which was read publicly in a synod of both islands in the year 1605. But this pious king had very little regard to promises, oaths, or charters, when they stood in the way of his arbitrary designs; he ordered therefore his ecclesiastical officers to pursue his instructions in the most effectual manner. Accordingly they took the presentations to vacant livings into their own hands, without consulting the presbytery; they annulled the oath, whereby all ecclesiastical and civil officers were obliged to swear to the maintenance of their discipline; and whereas all who received the holy sacrament were required to subscribe to the allowance of the general form of church-government in that island, the king's attorney-general and his friends now refused it. Their elders likewise were cited into the temporal courts, and stripped of their privileges; nor had they much better quarter in the consistory, for the governor and jurats made the decrees of that court ineffectual, by reversing them in the Town-hall.

Complaint being made to the court of these innovations, the king sent them word, that to avoid all disputes for the

* Heylin's Hist. Presb. p. 390, and Collier's Eccles. Hist. p. 705.
† Heylin's Hist. Presb. p. 396.

future, he was determined to revive the office and authority of a dean, and to establish the English Common Prayer-book among them, which he did accordingly;* and ordered the bishop of Winchester, in whose diocess they were, to draw up some canons for the dean's direction in the exercise of his government; which being done, and confirmed by the king, their former privileges were extinguished. Whereupon many left the islands and retired into France and Holland: however, others made a shift to support their discipline after a manner, in the island of Guernsey, where the episcopal regulations could not take place.

Mr. Robert Parker, a Puritan minister already mentioned, published this year a very learned treatise "Of the cross in baptism."† But the bishops, instead of answering it, persuaded the king to issue a proclamation, with an offer of a reward for apprehending him, which obliged him to abscond. A treacherous servant of the family having informed the officers where he had retired, they came and searched the house, but by the special providence of God he was preserved, the only room they neglected to search being that in which he was concealed, from whence he heard them quarrelling and swearing at one another; one saying, they had not searched that room, and another confidently asserting the contrary, and refusing to suffer it to be searched over again. Had he been taken, he had been cast into prison, where without doubt, says my author, he must have died. When he got into Holland, he would have been chosen minister of the English church at Amsterdam, but the magistrates being afraid of disobliging king James, he went to Doesburgh, and became minister of that garrison, where he departed this life 1630.

This year died the famous Dr. John Raynolds, king's professor in Oxford. He was at first a zealous Papist, while his brother William was a Protestant; but by conference and disputation the brothers converted each other, William dying an inveterate Papist, and John an eminent Protestant.‡ He was born in Devonshire 1549, and educated in Corpus-Christi college, Oxford, of which he was afterward president. He was a prodigy for reading, his memory being a living library. Dr. Hall used to say, that his memory and

* Collyer, vol. 2. p. 700. Heylin's Hist. Presb. p. 398, 399.
† Pierce, p. 171. ‡ Fuller's Abel Redivivus, p. 177.

reading were near a miracle. He had turned over all writers profane and ecclesiastical, as councils, fathers, histories, &c. He was a critic in the languages;* of a sharp wit and indefatigable industry; his piety and sanctity of life were so eminent and conspicuous, that the learned Cracanthorp used to say, that to name Raynolds was to commend virtue itself. He was also possessed of great modesty and humility. In short, says the Oxford historian, nothing can be spoken against him, but that he was the pillar of Puritanism, and the grand favourer of nonconformity. Atlength, after a severe and mortified life, he died in his college May 21, 1607, aged sixty-eight, and was buried with great funeral solemnity in St. Mary's church.

Soon after died the famous Mr. Thomas Brightman, author of a commentary upon the Song of Solomon, and the Revelations: he was born at Nottingham, and bred in Queen's college, Cambridge, where he became a champion for nonconformity to the ceremonies. He was afterward presented by sir John Osbourne to the rectory of Haunes in Bedfordshire, where he spent the remainder of his days in hard study, and constant application to his charge, as far as his conscience would admit.† His life, says Mr. Fuller, was angelical, his learning uncommon; he was a close student, of little stature, and such a master of himself, that he was never known to be moved with anger. His daily discourse was against episcopal government, which he prophesied would shortly be overthrown,‡ and the government of the foreign Protestant churches be erected in its place. He died suddenly upon the road, as he was riding with sir John Osbourne in his coach, by a sudden obstruction of the liver or gall, Aug. 24, 1607, aged fifty-one.

The king having given the reins of the church into the hands of the prelates and their dependants, these in return

* Wood's Ath. vol. 1. p. 290. † Church Hist. b. 10. p. 50.

‡ "How (asks bishop Warburton) would the historian have us understand this? As a true prophecy to be fulfilled, or a false prophet confuted?" The reply is Mr. Neal is to be understood as his author Mr. Fuller, from whom he quotes. Neither meant to ascribe to Mr. Brightman a prophetic inspiration, but only to relate his sentiments and apprehensions; to which, however the bishop may sneer, the events of the next reign bore a correspondence. The clause —"and the government of the foreign Protestant churches," &c. as Dr. Grey observes, is not in Fuller; who, however, says, that Mr. Brightman gave offence by "resembling the church of England to lukewarm Laodicea, praising and preferring the purity of foreign Protestant churches." He always carried about him a Greek Testament, which he read through every fortnight.—Ed.

became zealous champions for the prerogative, both in the pulpit and from the press. Two books were published this year, which maintained the most extravagant maxims of arbitrary power; one written by Cowel, LL.D. and vicar-general to the archbishop, wherein he affirms, 1. That the king is not bound by the laws, or by his coronation oath. 2. That he is not obliged to call parliaments to make laws, but may do it without them. 3. That it is a great favour to admit the consent of the subject in giving subsidies. The other, by Dr. Blackwood, a clergyman, who maintained that the English were all slaves from the Norman conquest. The parliament would have brought the authors to justice, but the king protected them by proroguing the houses in displeasure;* and to supply his necessities began to raise money by monopolies of divers manufactures, to the unspeakable prejudice of the trade of the kingdom.

This year died the famous Jacobus Arminius, divinity-professor in the university of Leyden, who gave birth to the famous sect still called by his name. He was born at Oudewater, 1560. His parents dying in his infancy, he was educated at the public expense by the magistrates of Amsterdam, and was afterward chosen one of the ministers of that city in the year 1588. Being desired by one of the professors of Franequer to confute a treatise of Beza's upon the Supralapsarian scheme of predestination, he fell himself into the contrary sentiment. In the year 1600, he was called to succeed Junius in the divinity-chair of Leyden, and was the first who was solemnly created doctor of divinity in that university. Here his notions concerning predestination and grace, and the extent of Christ's redemption, met with a powerful opposition from Gomarus and others. But though his disciples increased prodigiously in a few years, yet the troubles he met with from his adversaries, and the attacks made upon his character and reputation, broke his spirits, so that he sunk into a melancholy disorder, attended with a complication of distempers, which hastened his end, after he had been professor six years, and had lived *forty-*

* Rapin says, as Dr. Grey observes, 'the king interposed, and frustrated the parliament's design, by publishing a proclamation, to forbid the reading of these books, and to order copies to be delivered to the magistrates. But such proclamations are usually ill obeyed, especially when it is not the king's interest to see them strictly executed.' So that by these measures the king screened the persons of the authors – &c.

nine. He is represented as a divine of considerable learning, piety, and modesty, far from going the lengths of his successors, Vorstius, Episcopius, and Curcellæus; yet his doctrines occasioned such confusion in that country, as could not be terminated without a national synod, and produced great distractions in the church of England, as will be seen hereafter.

In the parliament which met this summer the spirit of English liberty began to revive; one of the members made the following bold speech in the house of commons, containing a particular representation of the grievances of the nation, and of the attempts made for the redress of them. "It begins with a complaint against the bishops in their ecclesiastical courts, for depriving, disgracing, silencing, and imprisoning, such of God's messengers (being learned and godly preachers) as he has furnished with most heavenly graces to call us to repentance, for no other cause, but for not conforming themselves farther, and otherwise than by the subscription limited in the statute of the 13th Elizabeth they are bound to do, thereby making the laws of the church and commonwealth to jar, which to reform (says he) we made a law for subscription, agreeing to the intent of the aforesaid statute, which would have established the peace both of church and state; and if it had received the royal assent, would have been an occasion that many subjects might be well taught the means of their salvation, who now want sufficient knowledge of the word of God to ground their faith upon.——

"And whereas by the laws of God and the land, ecclesiastical persons should use only the spiritual sword, by exhortation, admonition, and excommunication, which are the keys of the church, to exclude impenitent sinners, and leave the temporal sword to the civil magistrate, which was always so used in England, till the second year of the reign of king Henry IV. at which time the Popish prelates got the temporal sword into their hands; which statute was since by several acts of parliament made void; yet by virtue of that temporal authority once for a short space by them used, some ecclesiastical persons do use both swords, and with those two swords the oath *ex officio*, which began first in England by the statute of the second of king Henry IV.

being contrary to the laws of England, and, as I verily think, contrary to the laws of God.

"Wherefore to reform these abuses we made two good laws, one to abridge the force of the ecclesiastical commission in many points; the other to abrogate and take away the power of ecclesiastical persons to administer the oath *ex officio*, being a very hateful thing and unlawful.

"And forasmuch as among the canons lately made by the clergy of England in convocation, it was thought that some of their canons did extend to charge the bodies, lands, and goods, of the subjects of this realm, farther than was lawful and meet, we therefore made a good law to make void such canons, unless the same canons were confirmed by parliament.

"And as we had care of the church, so likewise of the commonwealth; and therefore, after searching the records of the Tower, and after hearing the opinion of lawyers, we found it clear, that impositions laid upon merchandise or other goods of the subject, by the king, without consent of parliament, was not lawful; and therefore we passed a bill, declaring that no imposition laid upon goods is lawful without consent of parliament.———

But God has not permitted these and sundry other good laws to take effect or pass into statutes, though we earnestly desired them; if they had, both the king and his subjects would have been more happy than ever; what would we not then have given to supply the king's wants? But as things now stand, and without reformation of the aforementioned grievances, we cannot give much, because we have no certainty of that which shall remain to us after our gift."

To put a stop to such dangerous speeches, the king summoned both houses to Whitehall, and told them, "that he did not intend to govern by the absolute power of a king, though he knew the power of kings was like the divine power; (for says his majesty) as God can create and destroy, make and unmake, at his pleasure, so kings can give life and death, judge all and be judged by none; they can exalt and abase, and like men at chess, make a pawn take a bishop or a knight."———After this he tells the houses, that as it was blasphemy to dispute what God might do, so it was sedition in subjects to dispute what a king might do in the

height of his power. He commanded them therefore not to meddle with the main points of government, which would be to lessen his craft, who had been thirty years at his trade in Scotland, and served an apprenticeship of seven years in England."

The parliament, not terrified with this high language, went on steadily in asserting their rights; May 24th, 1610, twenty of the lower house presented a remonstrance, in which they declare, "that whereas they had first received a message, and since by his majesty's speech had been commanded to refrain from debating upon things relating to the chief points of government; they do hold it their undoubted right to examine into the grievances of the subject, and to inquire into their own rights and properties, as well as his majesty's prerogative;* and they most humbly and instantly beseech his gracious majesty, that without offence to the same, they may, according to the undoubted right and liberty of parliament, proceed in their intended course against the late new impositions.——"

In another petition they beseech his majesty to put the laws in execution against Papists; and with regard to the Puritans they say, "Whereas divers learned and painful pastors that have long travailed in the work of the ministry with good fruit and blessing of their labour, who were ever ready to perform the legal subscription appointed by the 13th of Elizabeth, which only concerneth the profession of the true Christian faith and doctrine of the sacraments, yet for not conforming in some points of ceremonies, and for refusing the subscription directed by the late canons, have been removed from their ecclesiastical livings, being their freehold, and debarred from all means of maintenance, to the great grief of your majesty's subjects, seeing the whole people that want instruction lie open to the seducement of Popish and ill-affected persons; we therefore most humbly beseech your majesty, that such deprived and silenced ministers may, by licence or permission of the reverend fathers in their several dioceses, instruct and preach unto their people in such parishes and places where they may be employed, so as they apply themselves in their ministry to wholesome doctrine and exhortation, and live quietly and peaceably in their callings; and shall not by writing

* Warner's Eccles. Hist. Vol. 2. p. 495, 496.

or preaching impugn things established by public authority. They also pray that dispensations for pluralities of benefices with cure of souls, may be prohibited; and that toleration of nonresidency may be restrained. And forasmuch as excommunication is exercised upon an incredible number of the common people, by the subordinate officers of the jurisdiction ecclesiastical, for small causes, by the sole information of a base apparitor, so that the poor are driven to excessive expenses for matters of small moment, while the rich escape that censure by commutation of penance; they therefore most humbly pray for a reformation in the premises."

In another petition they represent to his majesty the great grievance of the commission ecclesiastical, and in all humility beseech his majesty to ratify the law they had prepared for reducing it within reasonable and convenient limits; they say, "that the statute 1 Eliz. cap. 1. by which the commission is authorized, has been found dangerous and inconvenient on many accounts:

First, "Because it enables the making such commission to one subject born as well as more.

Secondly, "Because under colour of some words in the statute, whereby the commissioners are authorized to act according to the tenor and effect of your highness's letters patent, and by letters patent grounded thereon, they do fine and imprison, and exercise other authorities not belonging to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, restored to the crown by this statute; for by the same rule your highness may by your letters patent authorize them to fine without stint, and imprison without limitation of time; as also according to will and discretion, without regard to any laws spiritual and temporal; they may impose utter confiscation of goods, forfeiture of lands, yea, and the taking away of limb and life itself, and this for any matter appertaining to spiritual jurisdiction, which could never be the intent of the law.

Thirdly, "Because the king, by the same statute, may set up an ecclesiastical commission in every diocess, county, and parish, of England, and thereby all jurisdiction may be taken from bishops and transferred to laymen.

Fourthly, "Because every petty offence appertaining to spiritual jurisdiction is by colour of the said words and

letters patent made subject to excommunication, whereby the smallest offenders may be obliged to travel from the most remote parts of the kingdom to London, to their utter ruin.

Fifthly, "Because it is very hard, if not impossible, to know what matters or offences are included within their commission, as appertaining to spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, it being unknown what ancient canons or laws spiritual are in force.

"As for the commission ecclesiastical itself, grounded on the statute above mentioned, it is a very great grievance, because,

1. "The same men have both spiritual and temporal jurisdiction, and may force the party by oath to accuse himself, and also inquire thereof by a jury; and lastly, may inflict for the same offence, and at the same time by one and the same sentence, both a spiritual and temporal punishment.

2. "Whereas upon sentences of deprivation or other spiritual censures, given by force of ordinary jurisdiction, an appeal lies for the party grieved; this is here excluded by express words of the commission. Also, here is to be a trial by a jury, but no remedy by traverse or attaint. Nor can a man have any writ of error, though judgment be given against him, amounting to the taking away all his goods, and imprisoning him for life, yea, to the adjudging him in the case of premunire, whereby his lands are forfeited, and he put out of the protection of the law.

3. "Whereas penal laws, and offences against them, cannot be determined in other courts, or by other persons, than those intrusted by parliament, yet the execution of many such statutes made since the 1st Elizabeth, are committed to the ecclesiastical commissioners, who may inflict the punishments contained in the statutes, being premunire, and of other high nature, and so enforce a man upon his oath to accuse himself, or else inflict other temporal punishments at pleasure; and after this, the party shall be subject in the courts mentioned in the acts to punishments by the same acts appointed and inflicted.

5. "The commission gives authority to oblige men, not only to give recognizance for their appearance from time to time, but also for performance of whatsoever shall be by

the commissioners ordered, and to pay such fees as the commissioners shall think fit.

"The execution of the commission is no less grievous to the subject; for, (1.) Laymen are punished speaking of the simony and other misdemeanours of spiritual men, though the thing spoken be true, and tends to the inducing some condign punishment. (2.) These commissioners usually allot to women, discontented, and unwilling to live with their husbands, such portions and maintenance as they think fit, to the great encouragement of wives to be disobedient to their husbands. And (3.) Pursuivants and other ministers employed in apprehending suspected offenders, or in searching for supposed scandalous books, break open men's houses, closets, and desks, rifling all corners and private places, as in cases of high treason.

"A farther grievance is, the stay of writs of prohibition, *habeas corpus*, and *de homine replegiando*, which are a considerable relief to the oppressed subjects of the kingdom. His majesty, in order to support the inferior courts against the principal courts of common law, had ordered things so, that writs had been more sparingly granted, and with greater caution. They therefore pray his majesty, to require his judges in Westminster-hall to grant such writs in cases wherein they lie.

"But one of the greatest and most threatening grievances, was the king's granting letters patent for monopolies, as licences for wine, alehouses, selling sea-coal, &c. which they pray his majesty to forbear for the future, that the disease may be cured, and others of like nature prevented."

The king, instead of concurring with his parliament, was so disgusted with their remonstrance, that he dissolved them [December 3, 1610] without passing any one act this session,* after they had continued above six years; and was so out of humour with the spirit of English liberty that was growing in the houses, that he resolved, if possible, to govern without parliaments for the future. This was done by the advice of Bancroft, and other servile court-flatterers, and was the beginning of that mischief, says Wilson,† which, when it came to a full ripeness, made such a bloody tincture in both kingdoms as never will be got out of the bishops' lawn sleeves.

* Fuller's Church Hist. b. 10. p. 30. † Hist. of King James, p. 16.

From the time that king James came to the English throne, and long before, if we may believe Dr. Heylin, his majesty had projected the restoring episcopacy in the kirk of Scotland, and reducing the two kingdoms to one uniform government and discipline; for this purpose archbishop Bancroft maintained a secret correspondence with him, and corrupted one Norton, an English bookseller at Edinburgh, [in the year 1589] to betray the Scots affairs to him, as he confessed with tears at his examination. The many curious articles he employed him to search into are set down in Calderwood's History, p. 246. In the month of January 1591, his letters to Mr. Patrick Adamson were intercepted, wherein he advises him, "to give the queen of England more honourable titles, and to praise the church of England above all others. He marvelled why he came not to England, and assured him he would be well accepted by my lord of Canterbury's grace, and well rewarded if he came."* This Adamson was afterward excommunicated, but, repenting of what he had done against the kirk, desired absolution; part of his confession runs thus: "I grant I was more busy with some bishops in England, in prejudice of the discipline of our kirk, partly when I was there, and partly by intelligence since, than became a good Christian, much less a faithful pastor; neither is there any thing that more ashameth me, than my often deceiving and abusing the kirk heretofore by confessions, subscriptions, and protestations."

Upon his majesty's arrival in England he took all occasions to discover his aversion to the Scots Presbyterians, taxing them with sauciness, ill-manners, and an implacable enmity to kingly power; he nominated bishops to the thirteen Scots bishopricks which himself had formerly abolished; but their revenues being annexed to the crown, their dignities were little more than titular. In the parliament held at Perth in the year 1606, his majesty obtained an act to restore the bishops to their temporalities, and to repeal the act of annexation; by which they were restored to their votes in parliament, and had the title of lords of parliament, contrary to the sense both of clergy and laity, as appears by the following protest of the general assembly:

"In the name of Christ, and in the name of the kirk in general, whereof the realm hath reaped comfort this forty-

* Pierce, p. 166.

six years; also in the name of our presbyteries, from which we received our commission, and in our own names, as pastors and office-bearers within the same for the discharging of our necessary duty, and for the disburdening of our consciences, we except and protest against the erection, confirmation, or ratification, of the said bishopricks and bishops by this present parliament, and humbly pray that this our protestation may be admitted and registered among the records."

In the convention at Linlithgow, December 12, consisting of noblemen, statesmen, and some court-ministers, it was agread, that the bishops should be perpetual moderators of the kirk-assemblies, under certain cautions, and with a declaration that they had no purpose to subvert the discipline of the kirk, or to exercise any tyrannous or unlawful jurisdiction over their brethren; but the body of the ministers being uneasy at this, another convention was held at Linlithgow, 1608, and a committee appointed to compromise the difference; the committee consisted of two earls and two lords, as his majesty's commissioners; five new bishops, two university-men, three ministers on one part, and ten for the other; they met at Falkland, May 4, 1609, and debated, (1.) Whether the moderators of kirk-assemblies should be constant or circular; and (2.) Whether the caveats should be observed. But coming to no agreement they adjourned to Striveling, where the bishops with great difficulty carried their point. And to increase their power, his majesty was pleased next year [in the month of February 1610], contrary to law, to put the high-commission into their hands.

Still they wanted the sanction of a general assembly, and a spiritual character; to obtain the former, an assembly was held at Glasgow, June 8, 1610, means having been used by the courtiers to model it to their mind. In that costly assembly, says my author,* the bishops were declared moderators in every diocesan assembly, and they or their deputies moderators in their weekly exercises; ordination and deprivation of ministers, visitation of kirks, excommunication and absolution, with presentation to benefices, were pinned to the lawn sleeves; and it was farther voted, (1.) That every minister at his entry shall swear obedience to

* Course of Scots Conformity, p. 13.

his ordinary. (2.) That no minister shall preach or speak the acts of this assembly. (3.) That the question of the parity or imparity of pastors shall not be mentioned in the pulpit under pain of deprivation. This was a vast advance upon the constitution of the kirk.

To obtain a spiritual character superior to the order of presbyters, it was necessary that the bishops elect should be consecrated by some of the same order; for this purpose the king sent for three of them into England, viz. Mr. Spotswood, archbishop of Glasgow, Mr. Lamb, bishop of Brechen, and Mr. Hamilton, bishop of Galloway, and issued a commission under the great seal to the bishops of London, Ely, Bath and Wells, and Rochester, requiring them to proceed to the consecration of the above-mentioned bishops according to the English ordinal: Andrews bishop of Ely was of opinion, that before their consecration they ought to be made priests, because they had not been ordained by a bishop. This the Scots divines were unwilling to admit, through fear of the consequences among their own countrymen; for what must they conclude concerning the ministers of Scotland, if their ordination as presbyters was not valid? Bancroft therefore yielded, that where bishops could not be had, ordination by presbyters must be valid, otherwise the character of the ministers in most of the reformed churches might be questioned. Abbot bishop of London,* and others, were of opinion, that there was no necessity of passing through the inferior orders of deacon and priest, but that the episcopal character might be conveyed at once, as appears from the example of St. Ambrose, Nectarius, Eucherius, and others, who from mere laymen were advanced at once into the episcopal chair.† But whether this supposition does not rather weaken the arguments for bishops being a distinct order from presbyters, I leave with the reader. However, the Scotch divines were consecrated in the chapel at London-house [October 21, 1610], and upon their return into Scotland conveyed their new character in the same manner to their brethren.‡ Thus the king, by a usurped supremacy over the kirk of Scotland, and other violent and indirect means, subverted their ecclesiastical constitution; and contrary to the genius of the people, and the protestation of

* Collyer, as Dr. Grey observes, mentions that as Bancroft's opinion, which Mr. Neal ascribes to bishop Abbot.—Ed.

† Collyer's Eccles. Hist. vol. 1. p. 702. ‡ Calderwood, p. 641.

the general assembly, the bishops were made lords of council, lords of parliament, and lord-commissioners in causes ecclesiastical; but with all their high titles they sat uneasy in their chairs, being generally hated both by the ministers and people.

About ten days after this consecration, Dr. Richard Bancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, departed this life; he was born at Farnworth in Lancashire, 1544, and educated in Jesus-college, Cambridge. He was first chaplain to Cox bishop of Ely, who gave him the rectory of Teversham near Cambridge. In the year 1585 he proceeded D. D. and being ambitious of preferment, got into the service of sir Christopher Hatton, by whose recommendation he was made prebendary of Westminster. Here he signalized himself by preaching against the Puritans; a sure way to preferment in those times. He also wrote against their discipline; and was the first in the church of England who openly maintained the divine right of the order of bishops. While he sat in the high-commission, he distinguished himself by an uncommon zeal against the Nonconformists, for which he was preferred, first to the bishoprick of London, and upon Whitgift's decease, to the see of Canterbury; how he behaved in that high station has been sufficiently related. This prelate left behind him no extraordinary character for piety, learning, hospitality, or any other episcopal quality. He was of a rough inflexible temper, yet a tool of the prerogative, and an enemy to the laws and constitution of his country. Some have represented him as inclined to Popery, because he maintained several secular priests in his own house; but this was done, say his advocates, to keep up the controversy between them and the Jesuits. Lord Clarendon says,* "that he understood the church excellently well, that he had almost rescued it out of the hands of the Calvinian party, and very much subdued the unruly spirit of the Nonconformists; and that he countenanced men of learning." His lordship might have added, that he was covetous,† passionate, ill-natured, and a cruel persecutor of

* Vol. I. p. 99, ed. 1707.

† Fuller, and after him Dr. Grey and Dr. Warner, vindicate the character of archbishop Bancroft from the charge of cruelty and covetousness; "which, when they are examined into (says Dr. Warner), appear not to deserve those opprobrious names in the strictest acception." On the other hand, the author of the Confessional calls *him*, the fiery Bancroft; and Dr. Warner sums up his account of him in a manner not very honourable to his name. "In short (says he) there have been archbishops who

good men; that he laid aside the hospitality becoming a bishop, and lived without state or equipage, which gave occasion to the following satire upon his death, which happened November 2, 1610, aged sixty-six.

Here lies his grace in cold clay clad,
Who died for want of what he had.

CHAP. II.

FROM THE DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT TO THE DEATH OF KING JAMES I.

Bancroft was succeeded by Dr. George Abbot, bishop of London, a divine of a quite different spirit from his predecessor. A sound Protestant, a thorough Calvinist, an avowed enemy to Popery, and even suspected of Puritanism, because he relaxed the penal laws, whereby he unravelled all that his predecessor had been doing for many years; "who, if he had lived a little longer (says lord Clarendon*), would have subdued the unruly spirit of the Nonconformists, and extinguished that fire in England which had been kindled at Geneva; but Abbot (says his lordship) considered the Christian religion no otherwise than as it abhorred and reviled Popery, and valued those men most who did that most furiously. He inquired but little after the strict observation of the discipline of the church, or conformity to the articles or canons established, and did not think so ill of the [Presbyterian] discipline as he ought to have done; but if men prudently forbore a public reviling at the hierarchy and ecclesiastical government, they were secure from any inquisition from him, and were equally preferred. His house was a sanctuary to the most eminent of the factious party, and he licensed their pernicious writings." This is the heavy charge brought by the noble historian against one of the most religious and venerable prelates of his age, and a steady friend of the constitution in church and state. If Abbot's moderate measures had been constantly pursued,

have been much worse than Bancroft, who by their good humour and generosity have been more esteemed when living, and more lamented at their death." Eccles. Hist. vol. 2. p. 497.—Edn.

* Book 1. p. 86.

the liberties of England had been secured, Popery discountenanced, and the church prevented from running into those excesses, which first proved its reproach and afterward its ruin.

The translation of the Bible now in use, was finished this year [1611]; it was undertaken at the request of the Puritan divines in the Hampton-court conference; and being the last, it may not be unacceptable to set before the reader in one view, the various translations of the Bible into the English language.

The New Testament was first translated by Dr. Wickliffe out of the Vulgar Latin, about the year 1380, and is entitled, "The New Testament, with the lessons taken out of the old law, read in churches according to the use of Sarum."

The next translation was by William Tyndal, printed at Antwerp 1526, in octavo, without a name, and without either calendar, references in the margin, or table at the end; it was corrected by the author, and printed in the years 1534 and 1536, having passed through five editions in Holland.

In the meantime Tyndal was translating several books of the Old Testament, as the Pentateuch, and the book of Jonah, printed 1531; the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the four books of Kings, the two books of Chronicles, and Nehemiah. About the same time George Joy, sometime fellow of Peter-college, Cambridge, translated the Psalter, the prophecy of Jeremiah, and the song of Moses, and printed them beyond sea.

In the year 1535, the whole Bible was printed the first time in folio, adorned with wooden cuts, and Scripture references; it was done by several hands, and dedicated to king Henry VIII. by Miles Coverdale. In the last page it is said to be printed in the year of our Lord 1535, and finished the fourth day of October. This Bible was reprinted in quarto 1550, and again with a new title 1553.

Two years after the Bible was reprinted in English, with this title, "The Holy Byble, which is all the Holy Scripture, in which are contayned the Olde and Newe Testament, truelye and purelye translated into English by [a fictitious name] Thomas Matthew, 1537." It has a calendar with an almanac; and an exhortation to the study of the Scrip-

ture, signed J. R. John Rogers; a table of contents and marriages; marginal notes, a prologue; and in the Apocalypse some wooden cuts. At the beginning of the prophets are printed on the top of the page R. G. Richard Grafton, and at the bottom E. W. Edward Whitchurch, who were the printers. This translation, to the end of the book of Chronicles, and the book of Jonah, with all the New Testament, was Tyndal's; the rest was Miles Coverdale's and John Rogers's.

In the year 1539 the above-mentioned translation, having been revised and corrected by archbishop Cranmer, was reprinted by Grafton and Whitchurch, "cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum." It has this title, "The Bible in Englyshe, that is to say, the content of the Holy Scripture, both of the Olde and Newe Testament, truely translated after the veritie of the Hebrue and Greke texts, by the diligent study of divers excellent learned men, expert in the foresayde tongues." In this edition Tyndal's prologue and marginal notes are omitted. It was reprinted the following year in a large folio, proper for churches, begun at Paris, and finished at London. In the year 1541 it was printed again by Grafton, with a preface by Cranmer, having been revised by Tonstal and Heath, bishops of Durham and Rochester. But after this time the Popish party prevailing at court, there were no more editions of the Bible in this reign.

Soon after king Edward's accession [1548—9], the Bible of 1541 had been reprinted, with Cranmer's prologue; and the liturgy of the church of England, being first composed and established, the translation of the Psalter, commonly called the old translation, in use at this day, was taken from this edition. Next year, Coverdale's Testament of 1535 was reprinted, with Erasmus's paraphrase; but there was no new translation.

In the reign of queen Mary [1555], the exiles at Geneva undertook a new translation, commonly called the Geneva Bible; the names of the translators were, Coverdale, Goodman, Gilby, Whittingham, Sampson, Cole, Knox, Bodleigh, and Pullain, who published the New Testament first in a small twelves, 1557, by Conrad Badius. This is the first that was printed with numerical verses. The whole Bible was published afterward with marginal notes, 1559, dedi

cated to queen Elizabeth. The translators say, "they had been employed in this work night and day with fear and trembling—and they protest from their consciences, that, in every point and word, they had faithfully rendered the text to the best of their knowledge." But the marginal notes having given offence, it was not suffered to be published in England* till the death of archbishop Parker, when it was printed [1576] by Christopher Barker, in quarto, "cum privilegio," and met with such acceptance, that it passed through twenty or thirty editions in this reign.

Cranmer's edition of the Bible had been reprinted in the years 1562 and 1566, for the use of the churches. But complaint being made of the incorrectness of it, archbishop Parker projected a new translation, and assigned the several books of the Old and New Testament to about fourteen dignitaries of the church, most of whom being bishops, it was from them called the Bishops' Bible, and was printed in an elegant and pompous folio, in the year 1568, with maps and cuts. In the year 1572, it was reprinted with some alterations and additions, and several times afterward without any amendments.

In the year 1582, the Roman-Catholic exiles translated the New Testament for the use of their people, and published it in quarto, with this title, "The New Testament of Jesus Christ, translated faithfully into English out of the authentic Latin, according to the best corrected copies of the same, diligently conferred with the Greek and other editions in divers languages; with arguments of books and chapters, annotations, and other necessary helps for the better understanding of the text, and especially for the discovery of the corruptions of divers late translations, and for clearing the controversies in religion of these days. In the English college of Rheims. Printed by John Fogny." The Old Testament of this translation was first published at Doway in two quarto volumes, the first in the year 1609, the other 1610, by Lawrence Kellam, at the sign of the Holy Lamb, with a preface and tables; the authors are said to be cardinal Allen, sometime principal of St. Mary-hall, Oxford; Richard Bristow, fellow of Exeter-college; and Gregory

* Here Mr. Neal, as Dr. Gray observes, appears to be mistaken; as Lewis says, "that the Geneva Bible was printed at London, in folio and quarto, in 1572." Lewis's History of the Translations of the Bible, in 8vo. p. 261, second edition, 1739.—Ed.

Martyn, of St. John's college. The annotations were made by Thomas Worthington, B. A. of Oxford; all of them exiles for their religion, and settled in Popish seminaries beyond sea. The mistakes of this translation, and the false glosses put upon the text, were exposed by the learned Dr. Fulke and Mr. Cartwright.

At the request of the Puritans in the Hampton-court conference, king James appointed a new translation to be executed by the most learned men of both universities, under the following regulations, (1.) That they keep as close as possible to the Bishops' Bible. (2.) That the names of the holy writers be retained according to vulgar use. (3.) That the old ecclesiastical words be kept, as *church* not to be translated *congregation*, &c. (4.) That when a word has divers significations, that be kept which has been most commonly used by the fathers.* (5.) That the division of chapters be not altered.† (6.) No marginal notes but for the explication of a Hebrew or Greek word. (7.) Marginal references may be set down. The other regulations relate to the translators comparing notes, and agreeing among themselves; they were to consult the modern translations of the French, Dutch, German,‡ &c. but to vary as little as possible from the Bishops' Bible.

The king's commission bears date 1604, but the work was not begun till 1606, and finished 1611. Fifty-four of the chief divines of both universities were originally nominated; some of whom dying soon after, the work was undertaken by forty-seven, who were divided into six companies; the first translated from Genesis to the First Book of Chronicles; the second to the prophecy of Isaiah; the third translated the four greater prophets, with the Lamentations and twelve smaller prophets; the fourth had the Apocrypha; the fifth had the four gospels, the Acts, and the Revelations; and the sixth the canonical epistles. The whole being finished and revised by learned men from both universities, the publishing it was committed to the care of bishop Bilson and Dr. Miles Smith, which last wrote the preface that is now

* Dr. Grey states more fully and accurately these rules from Lewis and Fuller: "used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogie of faith."—Ed.

† The division of the chapters to be altered either not at all, or as little as may be, if necessity so require." Lewis, p. 317. Fuller's Church Hist. b. 10. p. 46.—Ed.

‡ The translations pointed out by name, as Dr. Grey remarks, were those of Tyndal, Matthew, Coverdale, Whitchurch, and Geneva. —Ed.

prefixed. It was printed in the year 1611, with a dedication to king James, and is the same that is still read in all the churches.

Upon the death of Arminius, the curators of the university of Leyden chose Conradus Vorstius his successor. This divine had published a very exceptionable treatise* concerning the nature and properties of God, in which he maintained that God had a body; and denied his proper immensity and omniscience, as they are commonly understood. He maintained the Divine Being to be limited and restrained, and ascribed quantity and magnitude to him. The clergy of Amsterdam remonstrated to the States against his settlement at Leyden, the country being already too much divided about the Arminian tenets. To strengthen their hands, they applied to the English ambassador to represent the case to king James; and prevailed with the curators to defer his induction into the professorship till his majesty had read over his book;† which having done, he declared Vorstius to be an arch heretic, a pest, a monster of blasphemies; and to shew his detestation of his book, ordered it to be burnt publicly in St. Paul's churchyard, and at both universities; in the conclusion of his letter to the States on this occasion he says, "As God has honoured us with the title of defender of the faith, so (if you incline to retain Vorstius any longer) we shall be obliged not only to separate and cut ourselves off from such false and heretical churches, but likewise to call upon all the rest of the reformed churches to enter upon the same common consultation, how we may best extinguish and send back to hell these cursed [Arminian] heresies that have newly broken forth. And as for ourselves, we shall be necessitated to forbid all the youth of our subjects to frequent a university that is so infected as that of Leyden."‡ His majesty

* It may be wished that Mr. Neal had rather said "a treatise against which great exceptions were taken." His mode of expression intimates that those exceptions were justly grounded; this Vorstius himself denied, and solemnly declared his belief of the immensity and omniscience of the Divine Being, and ascribed the imputations cast on him to wresting his words to a meaning contrary to the scope and the connexion of the discourse. His abilities, learning, and virtues, were highly esteemed by those who differed from him. Præstantium ac Eruditorum Virorum Epistolæ. Amsterdam 1660; p. 490, &c. and p. 505; and the Abridgment of Brandt's History, vol. 2. p. 727, 728.—Ed.

† Brandt's History, vol. 2. p. 97; or the Abridgment, vol. 1. p. 318.

‡ "Nothing (it is well observed by Gerard Brandt) can be more edifying, than to see a Protestant prince, who, not contented to persecute the heterodox in his own kingdom, exhorts the potentates of the same religion to imitate his conduct." Brandt Abridged, vol. 1. p. 319.—Ed.

also sent over sundry other memorials, in which he styles Vorstius a wicked atheist: Arminius an enemy to God. And Bertius having written that the saints might fall from grace, he said the author was worthy of the fire.

At length [1612] the king published his royal declaration, in several languages,* containing an account of all that he had done in the affair of Vorstius, with his reasons; which were, his zeal for the glory of God, his love for his friends and allies [the States], and fear of the same contagion in his own kingdom; but their high mightinesses did not like the king of England's intermeddling so far in their affairs. However, Vorstius was dismissed to Gouda, where he lived privately till the synod of Dort, when he was banished the Seven Provinces; he then retired to Tonninghen, in the dukedom of Holstein, where he died a professed Socinian, September 19, 1622.†

His majesty had a farther opportunity of discovering his zeal against heresy this year, upon two of his own subjects. One was Bartholomew Legate, an Arian:‡ he was a comely person, of a black complexion, and about forty years of age, of a fluent tongue, excellently well versed in the Scriptures, and of an unblamable conversation. King James himself, and some of his bishops, in vain conferred with him, in hope of convincing him of his errors. Having lain a considerable time in Newgate, he was at length convened before bishop King in his consistory at St. Paul's, who, with some other divines and lawyers there assembled, declared him a contumacious and obdurate heretic, and certified the same into chancery by a significavit, delivering him over to the secular power; whereupon the king signed a writ§ *de*

* It was printed in French, Latin, Dutch, and English; on which Dr. Harris well remarks, that "consequently his monstrous zeal, his unprimely revilings, and his weak and pitiful reasonings, were known throughout Europe." Yet it was not held in any high reputation; for Mr. Norton, who had the printing of it in Latin, swore "he would not print it, unless he might have money to print it." Harris's Life of James I. p. 120.

† His sickness was a short one; but long enough to afford him an opportunity to teach his physician and other friends, how a Christian ought to die. He was wholly intent upon prayer, and scarcely repeated any thing but passages out of the Scriptures. At his request, Acts ii. and 1 Cor. xv. as mentioning the resurrection, were read to him: and this doctrine was much the subject of his last discourse. He expired, recommending his soul to God and Jesus Christ his Saviour. And it is said, that the piety, holiness, faith, and resignation, which he shewed, and the fervency of his prayers, cannot be well expressed. Brandt Abridged, vol. 2. p. 722, 723.—Ed.

‡ Fuller, b. 10. p. 63.

§ The reader will perhaps be curious to see the form of the king's writ for burning Legate; the latter part of which is as follows:

——"Whereas the holy mother-church hath not further to do and to prosecute on

heretico comburendo to the sheriffs of London, who brought him to Smithfield, March 18, and in the midst of a vast concourse of people burnt him to death. A pardon was offered him at the stake if he would recant, but he refused it.

Next month Edward Wightman, of Burton-upon-Trent, was convicted of heresy by Dr. Neile, bishop of Coventry and Litchfield, and was burnt at Litchfield, April 11th.* He was charged in the warrant with the heresies of Arius, Cerinthus, Manichæus, and the Anabaptists.†—There was another condemned to the fire for the same heresies; but the constancy of the above-mentioned sufferers moving pity in the spectators, it was thought better to suffer him to linger out a miserable life in Newgate, than to awaken too far the compassions of the people.

Nothing was minded at court but luxury and diversions. The affairs of the church were left to the bishops, and the

---

this part; the same reverend father hath left the aforesaid Bartholomew Legate, as a blasphemous heretic, to our secular power, to be punished with condign punishment, as by the letters patent of the same reverend father in Christ, the bishop of London, in this behalf above made, hath been certified to us in our chancery. We, therefore, as a zealot of justice, and a defender of the catholic faith, and willing to maintain and defend the holy church, and the rights and liberties of the same, and the catholic faith: and such heresies and errors every where what in us lieth, to root out and extirpate, and to punish with condign punishment, such heretics so convicted, and deeming that such a heretic, in form aforesaid convicted and condemned according to the laws and customs of this our kingdom of England in this part accustomed, ought to be burned with fire; we do command you that the said Bartholomew Legate, being in your custody, you do commit publicly to the fire, before the people, in a public and open place in West Smithfield, for the cause aforesaid; and that you cause the said Bartholomew Legate to be really burned in the same fire, in detestation of the said crime, for the manifest example of other Christians, lest they slide into the same fault; and this that in nowise you omit, under the peril that shall follow thereon. Witness," &c. A Narration of the Burning of Bartholomew Legate, &c. in Truth brought to Light, 1692, as quoted by Mr. Lindsey in his Conversations on Christian Idolatry, p. 119, 120.—Ed.

* Fuller, b. 10. p. 64.

† Some of the opinions imputed to Wightman savoured of vanity and superstition, or rather enthusiasm; such as, his being the prophet foretold Deut. xviii. and by Isaiah; the Elijah to come, of whom Malachi speaks. "But (as Mr. Lindsey justly remarks) we may well hesitate here, whether such were the man's real sentiments, or only those which his adversaries would fix upon him." These proceedings shew, as Brandt observes, it was high time to repeal the act *de heretico comburendo*. The sentiments of Lambroch on them deserve to be mentioned here. "These things (says he in a letter to Mr. Locke) are a scandal to the Reformation. A court of inquisition into men's faith, is alike contrary to Christian charity, whether it be erected on the banks of the Tiber, or the lake of Geneva, or by the side of the river Thames: for it is the same iniquitous cruelty, though exercised in another place, and on different subjects." A fine observation of Brandt on this occasion shall close this note. "It is a very glorious thing for the United Provinces (says he), that the blood of no heretic has been shed in that country ever since the Reformation; which ought to be ascribed to the moderation and great knowledge of the states-general, and the states of each of those provinces." Brandt Abridged, vol. 1. p. 319. Lindsey's Historical View of Unitarian Doctrine, &c. p. 204.—Ed.

affairs of state to subordinate magistrates, or the chief ministers, while the king himself sunk into a most indolent and voluptuous life, suffering himself to be governed by a favourite, in the choice of whom he had no regard to virtue or merit, but to youth, beauty, gracefulness of person, and fine clothes, &c. This exposed him to the contempt of foreign powers, who from this time paid him very little regard. At the same time he was lavish and profuse in his expenses and grants to his hungry courtiers, whereby he exhausted his exchequer, and was obliged to have recourse to arbitrary and illegal methods of raising money by the prerogative. By these means he lost the hearts of his people, which all his kingcraft could never recover, and laid the foundation of those calamities, that in the next reign threw church and state into such convulsions, as threatened their final ruin.

But while the king and his ministers were wounding the Protestant religion and the liberties of England, it pleased Almighty God to lay the foundation of their recovery by the marriage of the king's daughter Elizabeth to Frederic V. elector palatine of the Rhine, from whom the present royal family is descended. The match was promoted by archbishop Abbot, and universally approved by all the Puritans in England, as the grand security of the Protestant succession in case of failure of heirs from the king's son. Mr. Echard says, they foretold, by a distant foresight, the succession of this family to the crown; and it must be owned, that they were always the delight of the Puritans, who prayed heartily for them, and upon all occasions exerted themselves for the support of the family in their lowest circumstances.

The solemnity of these nuptials was retarded some months, by the untimely death of Henry prince of Wales, the king's eldest son, who died November 6, 1612, and was buried the 7th of December following, being eighteen years and eight months old. Some have suspected that the king his father caused him to be poisoned, though there is no sufficient proof of it;* the body being opened, his liver appeared

* These suspicions arose from the popular odium the king had incurred, from the behaviour of the court at the time the prince lay dead, and from the disappointment which the great expectations of the people from this prince suffered. There were insinuations to this effect from respectable persons: and colonel Titus assured bishop Burnet, that he had heard king Charles I. declare, that the prince his brother was

white, and his spleen and diaphragm black, his gall without choler, and his lungs spotted with much corruption, and his head full of blood in some places, and in others full of water. It is certain the king was jealous of his son's popularity, and asked one day, if he would bury him alive; and upon his death commanded, that no person should appear at court in mourning for him.* This prince was one of the most accomplished persons of his age, sober, chaste, temperate, religious, full of honour and probity, and never heard to swear an oath: neither the example of the king his father, nor of the whole court, was capable of corrupting him in these respects. He had a great soul, full of noble and elevated sentiments, and was as much displeased with trifles as his father was fond of them. He had frequently said, that if ever he mounted the throne, his first care should be to try to reconcile the Puritans to the church of England. As this could not be done without each party's making some concessions, and as such a proceeding was directly contrary to the temper of the court and clergy, he was suspected to countenance Puritanism. To say all in one word, prince Henry was mild and affable, though of a warlike genius, the darling of the Puritans, and of all good men; and though he lived about eighteen years, no historian has taxed him with any vice.

To furnish the exchequer with money several new projects were set on foot, as, (1.) His majesty created a new order of knights-baronets: the number not to exceed two hundred, and the expense of the patent 1,095*l.* (2.) His majesty sold letters patent for monopolies. (3.) He obliged such as were worth 40*l.* a year to compound for not being knights. (4.) He set to sale the highest honours and digni-

poisoned by means of viscount Rochester. This evidence amounted to a kind of proof, yet, as to these suggestions were opposed the opinion of the physicians, and the appearances of the body when it was opened, and the presumptive evidence did not come home to the king, it is to be wished that Mr. Neal had used more guarded language: for the words, "no certain proof," seem to imply, that there was probable proof of it. Bishop Warburton in therefore very angry, and says it "is abominable:" it is indeed a heavy charge to impute to a parent, his being accessary to the poisoning of a son. See D. Birch's Life of Henry Prince of Wales, p. 104—409. Dr. Grey, as well as the bishop, also censures our author, and refers to main authorities to disprove, as he calls them, "Mr. Neal's unfair insinuations." These insinuations did not originate, it should be observed, with Mr. Neal, but were sanctioned by the prevailing opinion of the times; and were countenanced by the conduct of James, who shewed himself quite unaffected with the death of his virtuous and amiable son.—Ed.

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 181. folio edit.

ties of the nation: the price for a baron was 10,000*l.* for a viscount 15,000*l.* and 20,000*l.* for an earl. (5.) Those who had defective titles were obliged to compound to set them right. And, (6.) The star-chamber raised their fines to an excessive degree.* But these projects not answering the king's necessities, he was obliged at last to call a parliament. When the houses met, they proceeded immediately to consider of and redress grievances, upon which the king dissolved them, before they had enacted one statute, and committed some of the principal members of the house of commons to prison, without admitting them to bail, resolving again to raise money without the aid of parliament.

This year the articles of the church of Ireland were ratified and confirmed; the reformation of that kingdom had made a very slow progress in the late reign, by reason of the wars between the English and natives, and the small proportion of the former to the latter. The natives had a strong prejudice against the English, as coming into the country by conquest; and being bigoted Papists, their prejudices were inflamed by king Henry VIII. throwing off the pope's supremacy, which threatened the loss of their religion, as well as their civil liberties. In the reign of Philip and Mary they were more quiet, when a law was passed against bringing in the Scots and marrying with them, which continued in force during the whole reign of queen Elizabeth, and was a great hinderance to the progress of the Protestant religion in that country; however, a university was erected at Dublin in the year 1593, and furnished with learned professors from Cambridge of the Calvinistical persuasion. James Usher, who afterward was the renowned archbishop of Armagh, was the first student who entered into the college. The discipline of the Irish church was according to the model of the English; bishops were nominated to the Popish dioceses, but their revenues being alienated, or in the hands of Papists, or very much diminished by the wars, they were obliged to throw the revenues of several bishopricks together, to make a tolerable subsistence for one. The case was the same with the inferior clergy, 40*s.* a year being a common allowance for a vicar in the province of Connaught, and some-

* Rapin, vol. 2 p. 185.

times only sixteen. Thus, says Mr. Collyer, the authority of the bishops went off, and the people followed their own fancies in the choice of religion.

At the Hampton-court conference the king proposed sending preachers into Ireland, complaining that he was but half monarch of that kingdom, the bodies of the people being only subject to his authority, while their consciences were at the command of the pope; yet it does not appear that any attempts were made to convert them till after the year 1607, when the act of the third and fourth of Philip and Mary being repealed, the citizens of London undertook for the province of Ulster. These adventurers built Londonderry, fortified Coleraine, and purchased a great tract of land in the adjacent parts. They sent over considerable numbers of planters, but were at a loss for ministers; for the beneficed clergy of the church of England, being at ease in the enjoyment of their preferments, would not engage in such a hazardous undertaking, it fell therefore to the lot of the Scots and English Puritans; the Scots, by reason of their vicinity to the northern parts of Ireland transported numerous colonies; they improved the country, and brought preaching into the churches where they settled; but being of the Presbyterian persuasion, they formed their churches after their own model. The London adventurers prevailed with several of the English Puritans to remove, who, being persecuted at home, were willing to go any where within the king's dominions for the liberty of their consciences, and more would have gone, could they have been secure of a toleration after they were settled; but their chief resource was from the Scots; the first minister of that persuasion that went over was Mr. Edward Bryce, who settled in Broad Island in the county of Antrim 1611; after him Mr. Robert Cunningham, in Hollywood in the county of Down. At the same time came over three English ministers, all Puritans trained up under Mr. Cartwright, viz. Mr. Ridges of Antrim, Mr. Henry Calvert, and Mr. Hubbard of Carrickfergus. After these, Mr. Robert Blair came from Scotland to Bangor, Mr. Hamilton to Bellywater, and Mr. Levingston to Killinshy in the county of Down, with Mr. Welsh, Dunbar, and others.* Mr. Blair was a zealous Presbyterian, and scrupled episcopal ordination, but the bishop of the

* Loyalty Presb. p. 101—103.

diocess compromised the difference, by agreeing that the other Scots presbyters of Mr. Blair's persuasion should join with him, and that such passages in the established form of ordination, as Mr. Blair and his brethren disliked, should be omitted or exchanged for others of their own approbation. Thus was Mr. Blair ordained publicly in the church of Bangor; the bishop of Raphoe did the same for Mr. Levingston; and all the Scots who were ordained in Ireland from this time to the year 1642, were ordained after the same manner; all of them enjoyed the churches and tithes, though they remained Presbyterian, and used not the liturgy; nay, the bishops consulted them about affairs of common concernment to the church, and some of them were members of the convocation in 1634. They had their monthly meetings at Antrim, for the promoting of piety and the extirpation of Popery. They had also their quarterly communions, by which means great numbers of the inhabitants were civilized, and many became serious Christians. Mr. Blair preached before the judges of assize on the Lord's day, at the desire of the bishop of Down, and his curate administered the sacrament to them the same day; so that there was a sort of comprehension between the two parties, by the countenance and approbation of the great archbishop Usher, who encouraged the ministers in this good work. And thus things continued till the administration of archbishop Laud, who, by dividing the Protestants, weakened them, and made way for that enormous growth of Popery, which ended in the massacre of almost all the Protestants in the kingdom.

It appears from hence, that the reformation of Ireland was built upon a Puritan foundation, though episcopacy was the legal establishment; but it was impossible to make any considerable progress in the conversion of the natives, because of their bigotry and prejudice against the English nation, whose language they could not be persuaded to learn.

The Protestant religion being pretty well established, it was thought advisable to frame some articles of their common faith, according to the custom of other churches: some moved in convocation to adopt the articles of the English church, but this was overruled, as not so honourable to themselves, who were as much a national church as Eng-

land, nor so consistent with their independency; it was therefore voted to draw up a new confession of their own; the draught was referred to the conduct of Dr. James Usher, provost of Dublin-college, and afterward lord-primate; it afterward passed both houses of convocation and parliament with great unanimity, and being sent over to the English court was approved in council, and ratified by the lord-lieutenant Chichester this year in the king's name.

These articles being rarely to be met with, I have given them a place in the Appendix,* being in a manner the same which the Puritans requested at the Hampton-court conference; for, first, The nine articles of Lambeth are incorporated into this confession. Secondly, The morality of the Lord's-day is strongly asserted, and the spending it wholly in religious exercises is required, [art. 56.] Thirdly, The observation of Lent is declared not to be a religious fast, but grounded merely on political considerations, for provision of things tending to the better preservation of the commonwealth, [art. 50.] Fourthly, All clergymen are said to be lawfully called and sent, who are chosen and called to this work, by men who have public authority given them in the church to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard, [art. 71.] which is an acknowledgment of the validity of the ordinations of those churches which have no bishops. Fifthly, The power of the keys is said to be only declarative, [art. 74.] Sixthly, The pope is declared to be antichrist, or that man of sin whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and abolish with the brightness of his coming, [art. 80.] Seventhly, The consecration of archbishops, bishops, &c. is not so much as mentioned, as if done on purpose, says Mr. Collyer, to avoid maintaining the distinction between that order and that of priests. Lastly, No power is ascribed to the church in making canons, or censuring those who either carelessly or wilfully infringe the same. Upon the whole, these articles seem to be contrived to compromise the difference between the church and the Puritans; and they had that effect till the year 1631, when, by the influence of archbishop Laud and the earl of Strafford, these articles were set aside, and those of the church of England received in their room.

To return to England. Among the Puritans who fled

* Vol. 3. Appendix, no. 6

from the persecution of bishop Bancroft, was Mr. Henry Jacob, mentioned in the year 1604. This divine, having conferred with Mr. Robinson, pastor of an English church at Leyden, embraced his peculiar sentiments of church-discipline, since known by the name of Independency. In the year 1619, Mr. Jacob published at Leyden a small treatise in octavo entitled, "The Divine beginning and institution of Christ's true visible and material church:" and followed it next year with another from Middleburgh, which he called "An explication and confirmation of his former treatise." Some time after he returned to England, and having imparted his design of setting up a separate congregation, like those in Holland, to the most learned Puritans of those times, as Mr. Throgmorton, Wring, Mansel, Dod, &c. it was not condemned as unlawful, considering there was no prospect of a national reformation. Mr. Jacob therefore, having summoned several of his friends together, as Mr. Staismore, Mr. Browne, Mr. Prior, Almey, Throughton, Allen, Gibbet, Farre, Goodal, and others; and having obtained their consent to unite in church-fellowship, for obtaining the ordinances of Christ in the purest manner, they laid the foundation of the first Independent or congregational church in England, after the following manner:—having observed a day of solemn fasting and prayer for a blessing upon their undertaking, towards the close of the solemnity each of them made open confession of their faith in our Lord Jesus Christ; and then standing together they joined hands, and solemnly covenanted with each other in the presence of Almighty God, to walk together in all God's ways and ordinances, according as he had already revealed, or should farther make them known to them. Mr. Jacob was then chosen pastor by the suffrage of the brotherhood, and others were appointed to the office of deacons, with fasting and prayer, and imposition of hands. The same year [1616] Mr. Jacob published a protestation or confession in the name of certain Christians, shewing how far they agreed with the church of England, and wherein they differed, with the reasons of their dissent drawn from Scripture; to which was added a petition to the king for the toleration of such Christians. And some time after he published "A collection of sound reasons, shewing how necessary it is for all Christians to walk in the ways and ordinances of God in purity, and in a right church

way." Mr. Jacob continued with his people about eight years; but in the year 1624, being desirous to enlarge his usefulness, he went with their consent to Virginia, where he soon after died. Thus, according to the testimony of the Oxford historian, and some others, Mr. Henry Jacob was the first Independent minister in England, and this the first congregational church. Upon the departure of Mr. Jacob his church chose Mr. Lathorp their pastor, whose history will be resumed in its proper place.

The king was so full of his prerogative, that he apprehended he could convince his subjects of its unlimited extent; for this purpose he turned preacher in the star-chamber and took his text, Psalm lxii. 1. "Give the king thy judgments, O God, and thy righteousness to the king's son."* After dividing and subdividing, and giving the literal and mystical sense of his text, he applied it to the judges and courts of judicature, telling them, "that the king sitting in the throne of God, all judgments centre in him, and therefore for inferior courts to determine difficult questions without consulting him, was to encroach upon his prerogative, and to limit his power, which it was not lawful for the tongue of a lawyer nor any subject to dispute. As it is atheism and blasphemy to dispute what God can do (says he), so it is presumption, and a high contempt, to dispute what kings can do or say; it is to take away that mystical reverence that belongs to them who sit in the throne of God."† Then addressing the auditory, he advises them, "not to meddle with the king's prerogative or honour. Plead not (says he) upon Puritanical principles, which make all things popular, but keep within the ancient limits."

In speaking of recusants, he says, there are three sorts, (1.) "Some that come now and then to church; these [the Puritans] are formal to the laws, but false to God. (2.) Others that have their consciences misled, some of these [the Papists that swear allegiance] live as peaceable subjects. (3.) Others are practising recusants, who oblige their servants and tenants to be of their opinion. These are men of pride and presumption. I am loath to hang a priest only for his religion, and saying mass; but if they refuse the oath of allegiance, I leave them to the law." He concludes with

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 192, 193, and note (9).

† Mr. Neal abridges Rapin, and gives the sense rather than the exact words

exhorting the judges to countenance the clergy against Papists and Puritans; adding, "God and the king will reward your zeal."

It is easy to observe from hence that his majesty's implacable aversion to the Puritans was founded not merely or principally on their refusal of the ceremonies, but on the principles of civil liberty and enmity to absolute monarchy; for all arguments against the extent of the prerogative are said to be founded on Puritan principles. A king with such maxims should have been frugal of his revenues, that he might not have stood in need of parliaments; but our monarch was extravagantly profuse, and to supply his wants delivered back this year to the Dutch their cautionary towns, which were the keys of their country, for less than a quarter part of the money that had been lent on them.

This year [1617] died the learned and judicious Mr. Paul Baynes, born in London, and educated in Christ-college, Cambridge, of which he was a fellow. He succeeded Mr. Perkins in the lecture at St. Andrew's church, where he behaved with that gravity and exemplary piety which rendered him universally acceptable to all who had any taste for serious religion, till archbishop Bancroft sending Dr. Harsnet to visit the university, called upon Mr. Baynes to subscribe according to the canons, which he refusing, the doctor silenced him, and put down his lecture. Mr. Baynes appealed to the archbishop, but his grace stood by his chaplains, and threatened to lay the good old man by the heels, for appearing before him with a little black edging upon his cuffs. After this Mr. Baynes preached only occasionally, as he could get opportunity, and was reduced to such poverty and want, that he said, 'he had not where to lay his head;' but at length death put an end to his sufferings in the year 1617. He published "A commentary upon the Ephesians;" "The Diocesian's trial" against Dr. Downham; and some other practical treatises. Dr. Sibbes says, he was a divine of uncommon learning, clear judgment, ready wit, and of much communion with God and his own heart. What pity was it, that such a divine should be restrained, and in a manner starved!"*

* See Clarke's Lives, annexed to his General Martyrology, p. 94; who tells us, that Mr. Baynes, being summoned on a time before the privy council, on pretence of keeping nonconformists, and called on to speak for himself, made such an excellent speech, that in the midst of it a nobleman stood up and said, "He speaks more like

The disputes in Holland between the Calvinists and Arminians, upon the five points relating to election, redemption, original sin, effectual grace and perseverance, rose to such a height as obliged the states-general to have recourse to a national synod, which was convened at Dort, November 13, 1618. Each party had loaded the other with reproaches, and in the warmth of dispute charged their opinions with the most invidious consequences, insomuch that all good neighbourhood was lost, the pulpits were filled with unprofitable and angry disputes, and as each party prevailed, the other were turned out of the churches. The magistrates were no less divided than the ministers, one city and town being ready to take up arms against another. At length it grew into a state faction, which endangered the dissolution of government. Maurice, prince of Orange, though a Remonstrant, put himself at the head of the Calvinists [or Contra-Remonstrants], because they were for a stadtholder, and the magistrates who were against a stadtholder sided with the [Remonstrants, or] Arminians, among whom the advocate of Holland, Oldenbarnevelt, and the pensionaries of Leyden and Rotterdam, Hogerberts and Grotius, were the chief. Several attempts were made for an accommodation, or toleration of the two parties; but this not succeeding, the three heads of the Remonstrants [Arminians] were taken into custody, and the magistrates of several towns and cities changed, by authority of the prince, which made way for the choosing such a synod as his highness desired. The classes of the several towns met first in a provincial synod, and these sent deputies to the national one, with proper instructions. The Remonstrants were averse to the calling a synod, because their numbers were as yet unequal to the Calvinists, and their leaders being in custody, it was easy to foretell their approaching fate. They complained of injustice in their summons to the provincial assemblies; but Trigland says, that where the Remonstrants [Arminians] were weakest, they were equally regarded with the other party; but in truth their deputies were angry and dissatisfied, and in many places absented from their classes, and so yielded up their power into the hands of their adversaries,

an ass than a man, and I dare not stay here to give a hint in any sentence against him.' Upon which speech he was dismissed and never heard any more from them. —T.

who condemned their principles, and deposed several of their ministers.

The national synod of Dort consisted of thirty-eight Dutch and Walloon divines, five professors of the universities, and twenty-one lay-elders, making together sixty-one persons, of which not above three or four were Remonstrants. Besides these, there were twenty-eight foreign divines, from Great Britain, from the Palatinate, from Hessia, Switzerland, Geneva, Bremen, Embden, Nassau, and Wetteravia; the French king not admitting his Protestant divines to appear. Next to the States' deputies sat the English divines; the second place was reserved for the French divines; the rest sat in the order recited. Upon the right and left hand of the chair, next to the lay-deputies, sat the Netherland professors of divinity, then the ministers and elders, according to the rank of their provinces; the Walloon churches sitting last. After the divines, as well domestic as foreign, had produced their credentials, the reverend Mr. John Bogerman, of Leewarden, was chosen president, the reverend Mr. Jacob Roland and Herman Faukelius, of Amsterdam and Middleburgh, assessors; Heinsius was scribe, and the reverend Mr. Dammon and Festius Hommius, secretaries; a general fast was then appointed, after which they proceeded to business.

The names of the English divines were, Dr. Carlton bishop of Landaff, Dr. Hall dean of Worcester, afterward bishop of Norwich; Dr. Davenant, afterward bishop of Salisbury; and Dr. Samuel Ward, master of Sidney-college, Cambridge;* but Dr. Hall not being able to bear the climate, Dr. Goad prebendary of Canterbury, was appointed in his room. Mr. Balcanqual, a Scotsman, but no friend to the kirk, was also commissioned by king James to represent that church. He was taken into consultation, and joined in suffrage with the English divines, so as to make one college; for the divines of each nation gave only one voto in the synod, as their united sense: and though Balcanqual did not wear the habits of the English divines, nor sit with them in the synod, having a place by himself as representative of the Scots kirk, yet, says the bishop of Landaff, his apparel was decent, and in all respects he gave much satisfaction. His majesty's instructions to them were, (1.) To agree among

* Fuller's Worthies, p. 159.

themselves about the state of any question, and how far it may be maintained agreeably to the Scriptures and the doctrine of the church of England. (2.) To advise the Dutch ministers not to insist in their sermons upon scholastic points, but to abide by their former confession of faith, and those of their neighbour reformed churches. (3.) That they should consult the king's honour, the peace of the distracted churches, and behave in all things with gravity and moderation.

When all the members of the synod were assembled, they took the following oath, in the twenty-third session, each person standing up in his place, and laying his hand upon his heart:

"I promise before God, whom I believe and worship, as here present, and as the searcher of the reins and heart, that during the whole course of the transactions of this synod, in which there will be made an inquiry into, and judgment and decision of, not only the well-known five points, and all the difficulties resulting from thence, but likewise of all other sorts of doctrine, I will not make use of any kind of human writings, but only of the word of God, as a sure and infallible rule of faith. Neither will I have any other thing in view throughout this whole discussion, but the honour of God, the peace of the church, and, above all, the preservation of the purity of doctrine. So help me my Saviour Jesus Christ, whom I ardently beseech to assist me in this my design, by his Holy Spirit."*

This was all the oath that was taken, says bishop Hall, as I hope to be saved. It was therefore an unjust insinuation of Mr. John Goodwin, who in his "Redemption redeemed," p. 395, charged them with taking a previous oath to condemn the opposite party on what terms soever. "It grieves my soul (says the bishop), to see any learned divine raising such imaginary conjectures; but since I have seen it, I bless my God that I yet live to vindicate them [1651] by this my knowing and clear attestation, which I am ready to second with the solemnest oath, if required."

The synod continued to the 29th of May, in which time there were one hundred and eighty sessions. In the hundred and forty-fifth session, and 30th of April, the Belgic confession of faith was debated and put to the question,

* Brandt, vol. 3 p. 63, or the Abridgment of Brandt, 8vo. vol. 2, p. 117.

which the English divines agreed to, except the articles relating to the parity of ministers and ecclesiastical discipline. They said they had carefully examined the said confession, and did not find any thing therein, with respect to faith and doctrine, but what was, in the main, conformable to the word of God.* They added, that they had likewise considered the Remonstrants' [Arminians] exceptions against the said confession, and declared that they were of such a nature as to be capable of being made against all the confessions of other reformed churches. They did not pretend to pass any judgment upon the articles relating to their church-government, but only maintained, that their own church-government was founded upon apostolical institution.

Mr. John Hales of Eton, chaplain to the English ambassador Carlton, sat among the hearers for some weeks, and having taken minutes of the proceedings, transmitted them twice or thrice a week to his excellency at the Hague. After his departure, Dr. Balcanqual, the Scots commissioner, and Dr. Ames, carried on the correspondence. Mr. Hales observes, that the Remonstrants behaved on several occasions very imprudently,† not only in the manner of their debates, but in declining the authority of the synod, though summoned by the civil magistrate in the most unexceptionable manner. The five points of difference between the Calvinists and Arminians, after a long hearing, were decided in favour of the former. After which the Remonstrant ministers were dismissed the assembly, and banished the country within a limited time, except they submitted to the new confession; on which occasion some very hard speeches were mutually exchanged, and appeals made to the final tribunal of God.

When the opinion of the British divines was read, upon the extent of Christ's redemption, it was observed that they omitted the received distinction between the sufficiency and efficacy of it; nor did they touch upon the received limitation of those passages, which, speaking of Christ's dying for the whole world, are usually interpreted of the world of the elect, Dr. Davenant and some of his brethren inclining to the doctrine of universal redemption.‡ In all other points there was a perfect harmony; and even in this Balcanqual says, king James and the archbishop of Canterbury desired

* Brandt, vol. 3. p. 288; or Abridgment, vol. 2. p. 508, 509.
† Hales's Remains, p. 507. 512. 526 506, 507. ‡ Brandt, p. 526.

them to comply, though Heylin says, their instructions were not to oppose the doctrine of universal redemption. But Dr. Davenant and Ward were for a middle way between the two extremes: they maintained the certainty of the salvation of the elect, and that offers of pardon were sent not only to all who should believe and repent, but to all who heard the gospel; and that grace sufficient to convince and persuade the impenitent (so as to lay the blame of their condemnation upon themselves), went along with these offers; that the redemption of Christ and his merits were applicable to these, and consequently there was a possibility of their salvation. However, they complied with the synod, and declared their confession, in the main, agreeable to the word of God; but this gave rise to a report some years after, that they had deserted the doctrine of the church of England; upon which bishop Hall expressed his concern to doctor Davenant in these words: "I shall live and die in suffrage of that synod of Dort; and I do confidently avow, that those other opinions [of Arminius] cannot stand with the doctrine of the church of England." To which bishop Davenant replied in these words: "I know that no man can embrace Arminianism in the doctrines of predestination and grace, but he must desert the articles agreed upon by the church of England; nor in the point of perseverance, but he must vary from the received opinions of our best approved doctors in the English church." Yet Heylin has the assurance to say, "that though the Arminian controversy brought some trouble for the present to the churches of Holland, it was of greater advantage to the church of England, whose doctrine in those points had been so overborne by the Calvinists, that it was almost reckoned for a heresy to be sound and orthodox [i. e. an Arminian] according to the book of articles established by law in the church of England." He adds, "that king James did not appear for Calvinism out of judgment, but for reasons of state, and from a personal friendship to prince Maurice, who had put himself at their head. He therefore sent such divines as had zeal enough to condemn the Remonstrants, though it was well known that he had disapproved the articles of Lambeth, and the doctrine of predestination; nor was it a secret what advice he had given prince Maurice before he put himself at the head of the Calvinists."*

* Hist. Presb. p. 301.

When the synod was risen, people spake of it in a very different manner;* the states of Holland were highly satisfied: they gave high rewards to the chief divines,† and ordered the original records of their proceedings to be preserved amongst their archives. The English divines expressed full satisfaction in the proceedings of the synod. Mr. Baxter says, the Christian world since the days of the apostles never had an assembly of more excellent divines. The learned Jacobus Capellus, professor of Leyden, declared, that the equity of the fathers of this synod was such, that no instance can be given since the apostolic age, of any other synod in which the heretics were heard with more patience, or which proceeded with a better temper or more sanctity. P. Du Moulin, Paulus Servita, and the author of the life of Waleus, speak the same language. But others poured contempt upon the synod, and burlesqued their proceedings in the following lines:

Dordrechti synodus, nodus; chorus integer, æger;
Conventus, ventus, sessio, stramen, Amen.

Lewis du Moulin, with all the favourers of the Arminian doctrines, as Heylin, Womack, Brandt, &c. charge them with partiality and unjustifiable severity. Upon the whole, in my judgment, they proceeded with as much discretion and candour as most assemblies ancient or modern have done, who have pretended to establish articles for other men's faith with penal sanctions. I shall take leave of this venerable body with this farther remark, that king James sending over divines to join this asssembly, was an open acknowledgment of the validity of ordination by mere presbyters; here being a bishop of the church of England sitting as a private member in a synod of divines, of which a mere presbyter was the president.

In the summer of the year 1617, king James made a progress into Scotland, to advance the episcopal cause in that country; the chapel of Edinburgh was adorned after the manner of Whitehall; pictures being carried from hence together with the statues of the twelve apostles, which were set up in the church. His majesty treated his Scots subjects with a haughty distance; telling them, both in the

* Brandt, p. 307, 308; or Abridgment, vol. 2. p. 531.

† Each divine of the United Provinces received four florins a day. The synod cost ten tons of gold, i. e. a million of florins. Brandt Abridged, vol. 2. p. 531.—Ed.

parliament and general assembly, "that it was a power innate, a princely special prerogative which Christian kings have, to order and dispose external things in the outward polity of the church, or as we with our bishops shall think fit; and, sirs, for your approving or disproving; deceive not yourselves, I will not have my reason opposed." Two acts relating to the church were passed this session; one concerning the choice of archbishops and bishops, and another for the restitution of chapters; but the ministers protesting against both, several of them were suspended and deprived, and others banished, as, the Melvins, Mr. Forbes, &c. and as the famous Mr. Calderwood, author of the Altare Damascenum, had been before; which book, when one of the English prelates promised to answer, the king replied, "What will you answer, man? There is nothing here than Scripture, reason, and fathers."*

Next year a convention or assembly was summoned to meet at Perth, August 25, 1618. It consisted of some noblemen, statesmen, barons, and burgesses, chosen on purpose to bear down the ministers; and with what violence things were carried, God and all indifferent spectators, says my author, are witnesses. In this assembly the court and bishops make a shift to carry the following five articles:

1. That the holy sacrament shall be received kneeling.

2. That ministers shall be obliged to administer the sacrament in private houses to the sick, if they desire it.

3. That ministers may baptize children privately at home, in cases of necessity, only certifying it to the congregation the next Lord's day.

4. That ministers shall bring such children of their parish as can say their catechism, and repeat the Lord's prayer, the Creed, and ten commandments, to the bishops to confirm and give them their blessing.

5. That the festivals of Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide, and the Ascension of our Saviour, shall for the future be commemorated in the kirk of Scotland.†

* This bishop Warburton understands as said ironically.—Ed.

† "A prince (observes a judicious historian) must be strangely infatuated, and strangly prejudiced, to employ his power and influence in establishing such matters as these! Let rites and ceremonies be deemed ever so decent; who will say, they are fit to be imposed by methods of severity and constraint? Yet, by these ways, those matters were introduced amongst the Scots, to the disgrace of humanity, and the eternal blemish of a prince, who boasted of his learning, and was for ever displaying his abilities." Dr. Harris's Life of James, p. 236, 237.—Ed.

66895

The king ordered these articles to be published at the market-crosses of the several boroughs, and the ministers to read them in their pulpits; which the greatest number of the latter refused, there being no penalty, except the king's displeasure: but the vote of the assembly at Perth not being sufficient to establish these articles into a law, it was resolved to use all the interest of the court to carry them through the parliament. This was not attempted till the year 1621, when the parliament meeting on the 1st of June, the ministers had prepared a supplication against the five articles, giving reasons why they should not be received or confirmed, and came to Edinburgh in great numbers to support it. Upon this, the king's commissioner, by advice of the bishops and council, issued a proclamation, commanding all ministers to depart out of Edinburgh within twenty hours, except the settled ministers of the city, and such as should have a licence from the bishop. The ministers obeyed, leaving behind them a protestation against the articles, and an admonition to the members of parliament not to ratify them, as they would answer it in the day of judgment. They alleged, that the assembly of Perth was illegal, and that the articles were against the privileges of the kirk, and the established laws of the kingdom: but the court-interest prevailed, and with much difficulty the articles were ratified, contrary to the sense of the kirk and nation. This bred a great deal of ill blood, and raised a new persecution throughout the kingdom, many of the Presbyterian ministers being fined, imprisoned, and banished, by the high-commission, at a time when, by their interest with the people, it was in their power to have turned their taskmasters out of the kingdom.*

Thus far king James proceeded towards the restitution of episcopacy in Scotland; but one thing was still wanting to complete the work, which was a public liturgy, or book of common prayer. Several consultations were held upon this head; but the king, being assured it would occasion

* Bishop Warburton is not willing to allow them the praise of acting with this caution and temper: "for (he remarks) soon after they used their interest to this purpose, and I believe they began to use it as soon as they got it." The bishop did not consider, that it is not in human nature, any more than it is consistent with wisdom and moderation, to proceed, though injured and provoked, to extremities at first. That the Scotch Presbyterian ministers should have great interest with the people, was the necessary consequence of their being sufferers for the principles of the kirk and the nation.—Ed.

an insurrection over the whole kingdom, wisely dropped it, leaving that unhappy work to be finished by his son, whose imposing it upon the kirk, without consent of parliament or general assembly, set fire to the discontents of the people, which had been gathering for many years.

To return to England. This year the learned Mr. Selden was summoned before the high-commission, for publishing his History of Tithes, in which he proves them not to be of divine but human appointment; and, after many threatenings, was obliged to sign the following recantation:

"My good lords,

"I most humbly acknowledge my error in publishing the History of Tithes, and especially in that I have at all (by shewing any interpretation of Holy Scriptures, by meddling with councils, fathers, or canons, or by what else soever occurs in it) offered any occasion of argument against any right of maintenance, *jure divino*, of the ministers of the gospel; beseeching your lordships to receive this ingenuous and humble acknowledgment, together with the unfeigned protestation of my grief, for that I have so incurred his majesty and your lordships' displeasure conceived against me in behalf of the church of England.

"January 28, 1618. JOHN SELDEN."

Notwithstanding this submission, Mr. Fuller says it is certain that a fiercer storm never fell upon all parsonage barns* since the Reformation, than what was raised by this treatise; nor did Mr. Selden quickly forget their stopping his mouth after this manner.

This year died the reverend Mr. William Bradshaw, born at Bosworth in Leicestershire, 1571, and educated in Emanuel-college, Cambridge. He was afterward removed, and admitted fellow of Sidney-college; where he got an easy admission into the ministry, being dispensed with in some things that he scrupled. He preached first as a lecturer at Abingdon, and then at Steeple-Morton. At length, by the recommendation of Dr. Chadderton, he was settled

* Bishop Warburton, because he himself approved of the principle of Mr. Selden's book, as placing the claim of tithes "on the sure foundation of law, instead of the feeble prop of an imaginary divine right," carps at this expression of Mr. Neal, though the words of Fuller; and asks "Where was the storm, except in the author's fanciful standish?" The answer is, the storm was in the offence Mr. Selden's doctrine gave the clergy, and the indignation of the court which it drew on him. The clergy published angry animadversions on it, and the king threatened to throw him into prison, if he replied in his own defence. British Biography, vol. 4. p. 377.—ED.

at Chatham in Kent, in the year 1601; but, before he had been there a twelvemonth, he was sent for by the archbishop to Shorne, a town situate between Rochester and Gravesend, and commanded to subscribe; which he refusing, was immediately suspended. The inhabitants of Chatham, in their petition for his restoration, say, that his doctrine was most wholesome, true, and learned, void of faction and contention; and his life so garnished with unblemished virtues and graces, as malice itself could not reprove him. But all intercessions were to no purpose: he therefore removed into another diocess, where he obtained a licence, and at length was chosen lecturer of Christ-church in London. Here he published a treatise against the ceremonies, for which he was obliged to leave the city, and retired to his friend Mr. Redriche's at Newhall in Leicestershire. The bishop's chancellor followed him thither, with an inhibition to preach, but by the mediation of a couple of good angels, says my author, the restraint was taken off.* In this silent and melancholy retirement he spent the vigour and strength of his days. At length, as he was attending Mrs. Redriche on a visit to Chelsea, he was seized with a violent fever, which in a few days put an end to his life, in the forty-eighth year of his age. He was full of heavenly expressions in his last sickness, and died with great satisfaction in his nonconformity. Dr. Hall, bishop of Norwich, gives him this character: "that he was of a strong brain, and of a free spirit, not suffering himself, for small differences of judgment, to be alienated from his friends, to whom, notwithstanding his seeming austerity, he was very pleasing in conversation, being full of witty and harmless urbanity: he was very strong and eager in arguing, hearty in friendship, regardless of the world, a despiser of compliments, a lover of reality, full of digested and excellent notions, a painful labourer in God's vineyard, and now, no doubt, gloriously rewarded." Such was this light, which, by the severity of the times, was put under a bushel!

In order to put a stop to the growth of Puritanism, and silence the objections of Papists against the strictness of the reformed religion; his majesty this year published, "A declaration to encourage recreations and sports on the Lord's

* Gataker's Life of Bradshaw, in Clarke's Lives, annexed to his General Martyrology.

day," contrary to his proclamation in the first year of his reign, and to the articles of the church of Ireland, ratified under the great seal, 1615, in which the morality of the Lord's day is affirmed. But (says Heylin) the Puritans, by raising the sabbath, took occasion to depress the festivals, and introduced, by little and little, a general neglect of the weekly fasts, the holy time of Lent, and the Embering days, reducing all acts of humiliation to solemn and occasional fasts."* Sad indeed! "But this was not all the mischief that ensued (says the doctor), for several preachers and justices of the peace took occasion from hence to forbid all lawful sports on the Lord's day, by means whereof the priests and Jesuits persuaded the people in the northern counties, that the reformed religion was incompatible with that Christian liberty which God and nature had indulged to the sons of men: so that, to preserve the people from Popery, his majesty was brought under a necessity to publish the book of sports."

It was drawn up by bishop Moreton, and dated from Greenwich, May 24, 1618, and it was to this effect:—"That for his good people's recreation, his majesty's pleasure was, that after the end of divine service, they should not be disturbed, letted, or discouraged, from any lawful recreations; such as dancing, either of men or women, archery for men, leaping, vaulting, or any such harmless recreations; nor having of may-games, whitson-ales, or morrice-dances, or setting up of may-poles, or other sports therewith used, so as the same may be had in due and convenient time, without impediment or let of divine service; and that women should have leave to carry rushes to the church for the decoring of it, according to their old customs; withal prohibiting all unlawful games to be used on Sundays only; as bear-baiting, bull-baiting, interludes, and at all times (in the meaner sort of people prohibited) bowling." Two or three restraints were annexed to the declaration, which deserve the reader's notice: (1.) No recusant [i. e. Papist] was to have the benefit of this declaration. (2.) Nor such as were not present at the whole of divine service. (3.) Nor such as did not keep to their own parish-churches, that is, Puritans.

This declaration was ordered to be read in all the parish-churches of Lancashire, which abounded with Papists; and

* Heylin's Hist. of Presb. 389, 390.

Wilson adds, that it was to be read in all the churches of England; but that archbishop Abbot, being at Croydon, flatly forbid its being read there. It was certainly an imprudent project, as well as a grief to all sober Protestants; and had the king insisted upon its being read throughout all the churches at this time, I am apt to think it would have produced the same convulsions as it did about fifteen years afterward.

It is hard to account for the distinction between lawful and unlawful sports on the Lord's day: if any sports are lawful, why not all? what reason can be given why morrice-dances, revels, may-games, whitson-ales, wakes, &c. should be more lawful than interludes, bull-baiting, or bowls? It cannot arise from their moral nature; for the former have as great a tendency to promote vice, as the latter. But the exceptions to the benefit of this declaration are more extraordinary: could his majesty think that the Puritans, who were present at part of divine service, though not at the whole; or that those who went to other parish-churches for their better edification, would lay hold of the liberty of his declaration, when he knew they believed the morality of the fourth commandment, and that no ordinance of man could make void the law of God? farther, his majesty debars recusants [i. e. Papists] from this liberty, which their religion had always indulged them; but these are now to be restrained. The Papist is to turn Puritan, with regard to the sabbath, being forbid the use of lawful recreations on the Lord's day; and Protestants are to dance and revel, and go to their may-games on that sacred day, to preserve them from Popery! This subject will return again in the next reign.

This year and the next proved fatal to the Protestant interest in Germany, by the loss of the Palatinate into the hands of the Papists, and the ruin of the elector Frederic V. king of Bohemia, who had married the king's only daughter. This being a remarkable period, relating to the ancestors of his present majesty king George II. it will be no useless digression to place it in a proper light. The kingdom of Bohemia was elective, and because their king did not always reside with them, a certain number of persons were chosen by the States, called defenders, to see the laws put in execution. There were two religions established

by law;* one was called *sub-una*, the other *sub-utraque*; the professors of the former were Roman Catholics, and communicated under one kind; of the latter Hussites, and since the Reformation Protestants, who communicated under both kinds. The emperor Sigismund, in order to secure his election to this kingdom, granted the Hussites an edict in the year 1435, whereby it was decreed that there should be no magistrate or freeman of the city of Prague, but what was of their religion. This was religiously observed till the year 1570, when, by order of the emperor Maximilian, a Catholic was made a citizen of Prague, after which time, the edict was frequently broken, till at length the Jesuits erected a stately college, and put the Papists on a level with the Protestants.† Matthias, the present emperor, having adopted his cousin Ferdinand of Austria, had a mind to get him the crown of Bohemia; for which purpose he summoned an assembly of the States, without sending as usual to the Protestants of Silesia, Moravia, and the Upper and Lower Alsatia; these therefore not attending (according to the emperor's wish) made the Catholics a majority, who declared Ferdinand presumptive successor to Matthias; after which he was crowned at Prague, and resided at Gratz. The defenders taking notice of this breach of their constitution, and perceiving the design of the imperial court to extirpate the Protestant religion, summoned an assembly of all the States, and among others, those of Silesia, Moravia, and Alsatia, who drew up a petition to the emperor, to demand the execution of the laws, and a reasonable satisfaction for the injuries they had received; after which they adjourned themselves to the Monday after Rogation week, 1618. The emperor, instead of granting their requests, ordered his lieutenant to hinder the reassembling of the States, as being called without his licence; but the States assembled according to the adjournment, and being

* These are the words of Rapin; but bishop Warburton says, "this is a mistake. These were not two religions, but one only, administering a single rite differently." This remark would be accurate, if the difference between the two parties had lain only in this point; but this could not be the case between the Catholics and Hussites; the difference between whom extended to many essential heads, though they were, with respect to this matter, denominated from one single point. But the bishop asserts, that "the fancy of two established religions in one state is an absurdity." But absurdities may exist, and this very absurdity exists, and did exist at the time his lordship wrote, in Great Britain: in one part of which episcopacy is the established religion, and in the other, Scotland, Presbyterianism. Ed.

† Rapin, vol. 2. p. 197, folio edit.

informed of the force that was designed against them, went in a body to the chancery, and having seized the emperor's chief-justice, the secretary and another of his council, they threw them out of the castle-window, and then drove the Jesuits out of the city. In order to justify their proceedings, they published to the world an apology, and having signed a confederacy, to stand by one another against all opposers, they chose twenty-four protectors, empowering them to raise forces, and levy such taxes, as they should find necessary.

In this situation of affairs, the emperor, who was also king of Bohemia, died, and on the 18th of August 1619, Ferdinand was chosen his successor in the empire, but the Bohemians not only disowned him for their king, but declared the throne vacant, and on September 5 chose Frederic elector palatine, king James's son-in-law, for their sovereign. Deputies were immediately sent to acquaint him with the choice, and pray him to repair immediately to Prague. Frederic dispatched an express to England, to desire the advice of his father-in-law; but the affair not admitting of so long delay, he accepted of the kingdom, and was crowned at Prague, November 4.

All the Protestant electors rejoiced at this providence, and gave him the title of king of Bohemia; as did most of the Protestant powers of Europe, except the king of England. It was acceptable news to the English Puritans, to hear of a Protestant prince in Bohemia; and they earnestly desired his majesty to support him, as appears by archbishop Abbot's letter, who was known to speak the sense of that whole party. This prelate being asked his opinion as a privy counsellor, while he was confined to his bed with the gout, wrote the following letter to the secretary of state. "That it was his opinion, that the elector should accept the crown; that England should support him openly; and that as soon as news of his coronation should arrive, the bells should be rung, guns fired, and bonfires made, to let all Europe see that the king was determined to countenance him."* The archbishop adds, "It is a great honour to our king, to have such a son made a king; methinks I foresee in this the work of God, that by degrees the kings of the earth shall leave the whore to desolation. Our striking in will

* Cabala, b. 1. p. 12; or p. 18 of the edition in 1663.

comfort the Bohemians, and bring in the Dutch and the Dane, and Hungary will run the same fortune. As for money and means, let us trust God and the parliament, as the old and honourable way of raising money. This from my bed (says the brave old prelate), September 12, 1619, and when I can stand I will do better service."

But the king disliked the archbishop's letter, as built upon Puritan principles; he had an ill opinion of elective kingdoms, and of the people's power to dispose of crowns; besides, he was afraid of disobliging the Roman-Catholic powers, and in particular the king of Spain, a near relation of the new emperor's, with whom he was in treaty for a wife for his son; so that the elector's envoy, after long waiting, was sent back with an admonition to his son-in-law to refuse the crown; but this being too late, he took it into his head to persuade him to resign it, and stood still, offering his mediation and sending ambassadors, while the emperor raised a powerful army, not only to reduce the kingdom of Bohemia, but to dispossess the elector of his hereditary dominions. Several princes of Europe gave king James notice of the design, and exhorted him to support the Protestant religion in the empire; but his majesty was deaf to all advice, and for the sake of a Spanish wife for his son, suffered his own daughter, with a numerous family of children, to be sent a begging, and the balance of Protestant power to be lost in the empire; for the next summer the emperor and his allies having conquered the Palatinate, entered Bohemia, and about the middle of November fought the decisive battle of Prague, wherein Frederic's army was entirely routed; his hereditary dominions, which had been the sanctuary of the Protestants in queen Mary's reign, were given to the duke of Bavaria, a Papist; the noble library of Heidelburgh was carried off to the Vatican at Rome, and the elector himself, with his wife and children, forced to fly into Holland in a starving condition.

Had the king of England had any remains of honour, courage, or esteem, for the Protestant religion, he might have preserved it in the Palatinate, and established it in Bohemia, by which the balance of power would have been on that side; but this cowardly prince would not draw his sword for the best cause in the world; however, this noble family was the care of Divine Providence, during a long

exile of twenty-eight years; after which they were restored to their dominions by the treaty of Munster, 1648, and declared presumptive heirs of the crown of Great Britain, in the last year of king William III. of which they took possession upon the death of queen Anne, 1714, to the inexpressible joy of the Protestant dissenters, and of all who loved the reformed religion and the liberties of their country.

Among the Brownists in Holland we have mentioned the reverend Mr. John Robinson, of Leyden, the father of the Independents, whose numerous congregations being on the decline, by their aged members dying off, and their children marrying into Dutch families, they consulted how to preserve their church and religion; and at length, after several solemn addresses to Heaven for direction, the younger part of the congregation resolved to remove into some part of America, under the protection of the king of England, where they might enjoy the liberty of their consciences, and be capable of encouraging their friends and countrymen to follow them. Accordingly they sent over agents into England, who having obtained a patent from the crown, agreed with several merchants to become adventurers in the undertaking. Several of Mr. Robinson's congregation sold their estates, and made a common bank, with which they purchased a small ship of sixty tons, and hired another of one hundred and eighty. The agents sailed into Holland with their own ship, to take in as many of the congregation as were willing to embark, while the other vessel was freighting with all the necessaries for the new plantation. All things being ready, Mr. Robinson observed a day of fasting and prayer with his congregation, and took his leave of the adventurers with the following truly generous and Christian exhortation:

"Brethren,

"We are now quickly to part from one another, and whether I may ever live to see your faces on earth any more, the God of heaven only knows; but whether the Lord has appointed that or no, I charge you before God and his blessed angels, that you follow me no farther than you have seen me follow the Lord Jesus Christ.

"If God reveal any thing to you, by any other instrument of his, be as ready to receive it as ever you were to receive any truth by my ministry; for I am verily persuaded, the

Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word. For my part, I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the reformed churches, who are come to a period in religion,* and will go at present no farther than the instruments of their reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; whatever part of his will our God has revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it; and the Calvinists, you see, stick fast where they were left by that great man of God, who yet saw not all things.

"This is a misery much to be lamented, for though they were burning and shining lights in their times, yet they penetrated not into the whole counsel of God, but were they now living, would be as willing to embrace farther light as that which they first received. I beseech you remember, it is an article of your church-covenant, that you be ready to receive whatever truth shall be made known to you from the written word of God. Remember that, and every other article of your sacred covenant. But I must here withal exhort you to take heed what you receive as truth,—examine it, consider it, and compare it with other scriptures of truth, before you receive it; for it is not possible the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick antichristian darkness, and that perfection of knowledge should break forth at once.

"I must also advise you to abandon, avoid, and shake off, the name of Brownists; it is a mere nickname, and a brand for the making religion and the professors of it odious to the Christian world."

On July 1 [1620], the adventurers went from Leyden to Delfthaven, whither Mr. Robinson and the ancients of his congregation accompanied them; they continued together all night, and next morning, after mutual embraces, Mr. Robinson kneeled down on the sea-shore, and with a fervent prayer committed them to the protection and blessing of

* The remarks of Acontius are pertinent here. "The cause (says he) that the relics of error and superstition are perpetuated is, that as often as there is any reformation of religion, either in doctrine or worship, men think that every thing is not to be immediately reformed at first, but the most distinguishing errors only are to be done away, and that when some time has intervened, the reformation will be completed with less difficulty. But the event hath, in many places, shown that it is more difficult to remove the relics of false worship and opinions, than it was at first to subvert fundamental errors. Hence it is better to correct every thing at once." "Sed ex eo tum fieri potest, ut maneant errorum atque superstitionum reliquiæ," &c. Acontii Stratagemetum Satanæ, libri octo. ed. 1652, p. 330.—Ed.

Heaven. The adventurers were about one hundred and twenty, who, having joined their other ship, sailed for New-England, August 5, but one of their vessels proving leaky they left it, and embarked in one vessel, which arrived at cape Cod, November 9, 1620. Sad was the condition of these poor men, who had the winter before them, and no accommodations at land for their entertainment; most of them were in a weak and sickly condition with the voyage, but there was no remedy; they therefore manned their long-boat, and having coasted the shore, at length found a tolerable harbour, where they landed their effects, and on the 25th of December began to build a storehouse, and some small cottages to preserve them from the weather. Their company was divided into nineteen families, each family having an allotment of land for lodging and gardens, in proportion to the number of persons of which it consisted; and to prevent disputes, the situation of each family was decided by lot. They agreed likewise upon some laws for their civil and military government, and having chosen a governor, they called the place of their settlement by the name of New Plymouth.

Inexpressible were the hardships these new planters underwent the first winter; a sad mortality raged among them, occasioned by the fatigues of their late voyage, by the severity of the weather, and their want of necessaries. The country was full of woods and thickets; their poor cottages could not keep them warm; they had no physician, or wholesome food, so that within two or three months half their company was dead, and of them who remained alive, which were about fifty, not above six or seven at a time were capable of helping the rest; but as the spring came on they recovered, and having received some fresh supplies from their friends in England, they maintained their station, and laid the foundation of one of the noblest settlements in America, which from that time has proved an asylum for the Protestant Nonconformists under all their oppressions.

To return to England; though the king had so lately expressed a zeal for the doctrines of Calvin at the synod of Dort, it now appeared that he had shaken them off, by his advancing the most zealous Arminians, as Buckeridge, Neile, Harsnet, and Laud, to some of the best bishopricks in the kingdom. These divines, apprehending their prin-

ciples hardly consistent with the thirty-nine articles, fell in with the prerogative, and covered themselves under the wing of his majesty's pretensions to unlimited power, which gave rise to a new distinction at court between church and state Puritans. All were Puritans with king James, who stood by the laws of the land in opposition to his arbitrary government, though otherwise never so good churchmen; these were Puritans in the state, as those who scrupled the ceremonies, and espoused the doctrines of Calvin, were in the church. The church Puritans were comparatively few, but being joined by those who stood by the constitution, they became the majority of the nation. To balance these, the king protected and countenanced the Arminians and Papists, who joined heartily with the prerogative, and became a state faction against the old English constitution. The parties being thus formed grew up into a hatred of each other. All who opposed the king's arbitrary measures were called at court by the name of Puritans; and those that stood by the crown in opposition to the parliament, went by the names of Papists and Arminians. These were the seeds of those factions, which occasioned all the disturbances in the following reign.

The Palatinate being lost, and the king's son-in-law and daughter forced to take sanctuary in Holland, the whole world murmured at his majesty's indolence, both as a father and a Protestant; these murmurs obliged him at length to have recourse to a parliament, from whom he hoped to squeeze a little money to spend upon his pleasures; at the opening of the session, January 20, 1620—1, his majesty told them, "that they were no other than his council, to give him advice as to what he should ask. It is the king (says he) that makes laws, and ye are to advise him to make such as will be best for the commonwealth:"——With regard to his tolerating Popery, on the account of his son's match, he professes "he will do nothing but what shall be for the good of religion."——With regard to the Palatinate, he says, "if he cannot get it restored by fair means, his crown, his blood, and his son's blood, shall be spent for its recovery." He therefore commands them not to hunt after grievances, but to be quick and speedy in giving him money. Though the parliament did not credit the king's speech, yet the occasion was so reasonable, that the commons

immediately voted him two entire subsidies, and the clergy three; but finding his majesty awed by the Spaniard, and making no preparation for war, they began to inquire into grievances, upon which the king adjourned the houses (a power not claimed by any of his predecessors); but upon the day of adjournment the commons drew up a declaration, wherein they say, "that being touched with a true sense and fellow-feeling of the sufferings of the king's children, and of the true professors of the same Christian religion professed by the church of England in foreign parts, as members of the same body, they unanimously declare, that they will be ready, to the utmost of their power, both with their lives and fortunes, to assist his majesty, so as that he may be able to do that with his sword, which by a peaceable course shall not be effected."

Upon their reassembling in the month of November, finding the king still amused by the Spanish match, while the Protestant interest in the Palatinate was expiring, the commons drew up a large remonstrance, in which they represent the danger of the Protestant religion from the growth of Popery; from the open resort of Papists to the ambassador's chapels; from the frequent and numerous conventicles both in city and country; from the interposing of foreign ambassadors in their favour; from the compounding of their forfeitures for such small sums of money as amount to little less than a toleration; from the education of gentlemen's children in Popish seminaries, and the licentious printing and publishing Popish books; wherefore they pray his majesty to take his sword in hand for the recovery of the Palatinate, to put the laws in execution against Papists, to break off the Spanish match, and to marry his son to a Protestant princess. The king, hearing of this remonstrance, sent the speaker a letter from Newmarket to acquaint the house, "that he absolutely forbid their meddling with any thing concerning his government, or with his son's match;" and to keep them in awe, his majesty declared, "that he thinks himself at liberty to punish any man's misdemeanours in parliament, as well during their sitting as after, which he means not to spare hereafter upon occasion of any man's insolent behaviour in the house."* In answer to this letter, the commons drew up a petition to present with their re-

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 208. 211, folio ed.

monstrance, in which they insist upon the laws of their country, and the freedom of debates in parliament. The king returned them a long answer, which concludes with denying them, what they call their "ancient and undoubted right and inheritance." The commons, in debate upon his majesty's answer, drew up a protestation in maintenance of their claim, and caused it to be entered in their journal-book. Upon this, the king, being come to London, declared in council the protestation to be null, and with great indignation tore it out of the book with his own hand. A few days after he dissolved the parliament, and issued a proclamation forbidding his subjects to talk of state-affairs.* He also committed the leading members to prison, as, sir Edward Coke, sir Robert Philips, Mr. Selden, Mr. Pym, and Mr. Mallery; others were sent into Ireland, and the earls of Oxford and Southampton were confined in the Tower.†

The king having parted with his parliament, was at liberty to gratify the Spaniards, by indulging the Papists; for this purpose the lord-keeper Williams, by his majesty's command, wrote to all the judges, "that in their several circuits they discharge all prisoners for church-recusancy; or for refusing the oath of supremacy; or for dispersing Popish books; or hearing or saying mass; or for any other point of recusancy that concerned religion only."‡ Accordingly the Jesuits and Popish recusants of all sorts were enlarged, to the number, says Mr. Prynne, of four thousand;§ all prosecutions were stayed, and the penal laws suspended. Upon this, great numbers of Jesuits, and other missionaries, flocked into England; mass was celebrated openly in the countries; and in London their private assemblies were so crowded, that at a meeting in Blackfriars [November 5, 1622, N. S.] the floor sunk under them, and killed the preacher and ninety-three of the hearers.

While the Papists were countenanced, the court and the new bishops bore hard upon the Puritans, filling the pulpits with men of arbitrary principles, and punishing those

* Wil[illegible], p. 190, [illegible], Rapin, vol. 2. p. 212, and note 4, fol. edit.

† According to Tyndal, as observes Dr. Grey, the earl of Southampton was committed to [illegible] Westminster. Ed.

‡ Fuller, b. 10. p. 104.

§ Dr. G[illegible] [illegible] the authority of Fuller against Prynne's account, who says, that, according to John Gee's perfect list, all the Jesuits in England did not amount to more than two hundred and twenty-five. But Prynne's account, which Mr. Neal adopts, is on the other hand confirmed by Tyndal, who informs us, on the testimony of Wilson, that Gee [illegible] used to boast that four thousand recusants had been released through his intercession. Rapin's History, vol. 2. p. 215, note 7. Ed.

who dared to preach for the rights of the subject. The reverend Mr. Knight, of Broadsgate-hall, in a sermon before the university of Oxford, on 2 Kings xix. 9, advanced this proposition, that "subordinate magistrates might lawfully make use of force, and defend themselves, the commonwealth, and the true religion, in the field, against the chief magistrate, within the cases and conditions following, 1. When the chief magistrate turns tyrant. 2. When he forces his subjects upon blasphemy or idolatry. 3. When any intolerable burdens or pressures are laid upon them. 4. When resistance is the only expedient to secure their lives, their fortunes, and the liberty of their consciences." The court being informed of this sermon, sent for the preacher, and asked him, what authority he had for this assertion; he answered, Paræus on Romans xiii.; but that his principal authority was king James himself, who was sending assistance to the Rochellers against their natural prince. Upon this bold answer, Mr. Knight was confined in the Gatehouse; Paræus's commentaries were burnt at Oxford and London; his assertions were condemned as false and seditious; and the university of Oxford in full convocation passed a decree that it was not lawful for subjects to appear offensively in arms against their king on the score of religion, or on any other account, according to the Scripture. How this was reconcilable with the king's assisting the French Hugonots, I must leave with the reader. But to bind the nation down for ever in principles of slavery, all graduates of the university of Oxford were enjoined to subscribe the above-mentioned decree, and to swear, that they would always continue of the same opinion. Was there ever such an unreasonable oath? for a man to swear he will always be of the same mind! Yet such was the severity of the times!

But to distress the Puritans more effectually, the king sent the following directions to the archbishop, to be communicated to all the clergy of his province, dated from Windsor, August 10, 1622.

1. "That no preacher, under a bishop or dean, shall make a set discourse, or fall into any common place of divinity in his sermons, not comprehended in the thirty-nine articles.*

* Or, as Dr. Grey would add, "some of the homilies of the church of England." —Ed.

2. "That no parson, vicar, curate, or lecturer, shall preach any sermon hereafter, on Sundays or holidays in the afternoon, but expound the catechism, creed, or ten commandments;* and that those be most encouraged who catechise children only.

3. "That no preacher, under a bishop or dean, presume to preach in any popular auditory on the deep points of predestination, election, reprobation; or of the universality, efficacy, resistibility, or irresistibility, of God's grace.

4. "That no preacher of any degree soever, shall henceforth presume in any auditory to declare, limit, or set bounds to, the prerogative, power, or jurisdiction, of sovereign princes, or meddle with matters of state.

5. "That no preacher shall use railing speeches against Papists or Puritans, but endeavour to free the doctrine and discipline of the church in a grave manner from the aspersions of both adversaries.

6. "That the archbishop and bishops be more wary for the future, in licensing preachers; and that all lecturers throughout the kingdom be licensed in the court of faculties, by recommendation from the bishop of the diocess, with a fiat from the archbishop, and a confirmation under the great seal of England.

"Those that offended against any of these injunctions were to be suspended *ab officio et beneficio* for a year and a day, till his majesty should prescribe some farther punishment with advice of convocation."

Here is nothing that could affect Papists or Arminians, but almost every article points at the Puritans. The king had assisted in maintaining these doctrines in Holland, but will not have them propagated in England. The thirty-nine articles were established by law, and yet none under a bishop or dean may preach on the seventeenth, concerning predestination. The ministers of God's word may not limit the prerogative, but they may preach concerning its unlimited extent; and though the second injunction admits of their expounding the catechism, Fuller says, "the bishops' officials were so active, that in many places they tied up preachers in the afternoon to the very letter of the catechism, allowing them no liberty to expound or enlarge upon any of

* Or, as the same writer would subjoin, "the Lord's Prayer" (funeral sermons alone excepted).—Ed.

the answers."* The Puritans had suffered hitherto only for the neglect of ceremonies, but now their very doctrine is an offence. From this time, all Calvinists were in a manner excluded from court-preferments. The way to rise in the church, was to preach up the absolute power of the king, to declaim against the rigours of Calvinism, and to speak favourably of Popery. Those who scrupled this were neglected, and distinguished by the name of Doctrinal Puritans; but it was the glory of this people that they stood together, like a wall, against the arbitrary proceedings of the king, both in church and state.

Archbishop Abbot was at the head of the Doctrinal Puritans; and often advised the king to return to the old parliamentary way of raising money. This cost him his interest at court; and an accident happened this year, which quite broke his spirits, and made him retire from the world. Lord Zouch invited his grace to a buck-hunting in Bramshill-park in Hampshire; and while the keeper was running among the deer, to bring them to a fairer mark, the archbishop, sitting on horseback, let fly a barbed arrow, which shot him under the arm-pit, and killed him upon the spot. His grace was so distressed in mind with the accident, that he retired to one of his own alms-houses at Guilford; and though upon examination of the case it was judged casual homicide, he kept that day as a fast as long as he lived; and allowed the keeper's widow 20*l.* a year for her maintenance. The king also, being moved with compassion, sent for him to Lambeth, and gave him a royal pardon and dispensation to prevent all exceptions to his episcopal character; but he prudently withdrew from the council-board, where his advice had been little regarded before, as coming from a person of unfashionable principles.

The Puritans lost an eminent practical writer and preacher about this time, Nicholas Byfield, born in Warwickshire, and educated in Exeter-college, Oxford. After four years, he left the university, and went for Ireland; but preaching at Chester, the inhabitants gave him a unanimous invitation to St. Peter's church in that city, where he resided seven years. From thence he removed to Isleworth in Middlesex, and remained there till his death. He was a divine of a profound judgment, a strong memory, quick

* Book 10. p. 111.

invention, and unwearied industry, which brought the stone upon him, which sent him to his grave, in the forty-fifth year of his age. His body being opened, a stone was taken out of his bladder, that weighed thirty-three ounces, and was in measure about the edge, fifteen inches and a half; about the length and breadth thirteen inches, and solid like a flint; an almost incredible relation! But Dr. William Gouge, who drew up this account, was an eye-witness of it, with many others. Mr. Byfield was a Calvinist, a nonconformist to the ceremonies, and a strict observer of the sabbath. He published several books in his lifetime; and his commentaries upon the Colossians and St. Peter, published after his death, shew him to be a divine of great piety, capacity, and learning.*

The archbishop being in disgrace, the council were unanimous, and met with no interruption in their proceedings. The Puritans retired to the new plantations in America, and Popery came in like an armed man. This was occasioned partly by the new promotions at court, but chiefly by the Spanish match, which was begun about the year 1617, and drawn out to a length of seven years, till the Palatinate was lost, and the Protestant religion in a manner extirpated out of the kingdom of Bohemia and other parts of Germany; and then the match itself was broke off.

To trace this affair from its beginning, because it was the source of the ensuing calamities of this and the following reign. Prince Charles being arrived at the state of manhood, the king had thoughts of marrying him, but could find no Protestant princess of an equal rank. He despised the princes of Germany, and would hear of nothing beneath a king's daughter. This put him upon seeking a wife for him out of the house of Austria, sworn enemies to the Protestant religion; for which purpose he entered into a treaty with Spain for the infanta. Under colour of this match, Gondamar, the Spanish ambassador, made the king do whatever he pleased. If he inclined to assist his son-in-law in recovering the Palatinate, he was told he must keep fair with the house of Austria, or the match was at end. If he denied any favours to the Papists at home, the court of Rome, and all the Roman-Catholic powers, were disobliged, and then it could never take place. To obviate these and

* Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. 1. p. 102, Fuller's Worthies, 1681, p. 353.

other objections, his majesty promised, upon the word of a king, that no Roman Catholic should be proceeded against capitally; and though he could not at present repeal the pecuniary laws, that he would mitigate them to the satisfaction of the Catholic king; and the lengths his majesty went in favour of Papists on this occasion, will appear by the following articles, which were inserted both into the Spanish and French treaty which afterward took place.

The articles of the intended Spanish match relating to religion, were these:

Art. 6. "The infanta herself, her men and maid servants, her children and descendants, and all their families, of what sort soever, serving her highness, may freely and publicly profess themselves Catholics.*

Art. 5, 7, and 8. "Provide a church, a chapel, and an oratory, for her highness, with all Popish ornaments, utensils, and decorations.

Art. 10, 11, and 12. "Allow her twenty-four priests and assistants, and over them a bishop, with full authority and spiritual jurisdiction.

Art. 14. "Admits the infanta and her servants to procure from Rome dispensations, indulgences, jubilees, &c. and all graces, as shall seem meet to them.

Art. 17. "Provides, that the laws made against Roman Catholics in England, or in any of the king's dominions, shall not extend to the children of this marriage; nor shall they lose their succession to the crown, although they be Roman Catholics.

Art. 18 and 21. "Authorize the infanta to choose nurses for her children, and to bring them up in her religion till they are ten years of age."——But the term was afterward enlarged to twelve; and in the match with France, to thirteen.

King James swore to the observation of these articles, in the presence of the two Spanish ambassadors, and twenty-four privy-counsellors, who set their hands to the treaty. Besides which, his majesty and prince of Wales swore to the four following private ones, (1.) "That no laws against Papists should hereafter be put in execution. (2.) That no new laws shall be made against them; but that there shall be a perpetual toleration of the Roman-Catholic re-

* Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 86; Rapin, vol. 2. 217, 218, folio edit.

ligion in private houses, throughout all his majesty's dominions, which his council shall swear to. (3.) That he will never persuade the infanta to change her religion. (4). That he will use all his authority and influence to have these conditions ratified by parliament, that so all penal laws against Papists may not only be suspended, but legally disannulled."

The words of the prince of Wales's oath were these: "I Charles, prince of Wales, engage myself——that all things contained in the foregoing articles, which concern as well the suspension as abrogation of all laws made against Roman Catholics, shall within three years infallibly take effect, and sooner if possible; which we will have to lie upon our conscience and royal honour: and I will intercede with my father that the ten years of education of the children that shall be born of this marriage, which the pope of Rome desires may be lengthened to twelve, shall be prolonged to the said term. And I swear, that if the entire power of disposing this matter be devolved upon me, I will grant and approve of the said term.* Furthermore, as oft as the infanta shall desire that I should give ear to divines and others, whom her highness shall be pleased to employ in matters of the Roman-Catholic religion, I will hearken to them willingly, without all difficulties, and laying aside all excuses."

Under these advantages, the Papists appeared openly, and behaved with an offensive insolence; but the hearts of all true Protestants trembled for themselves and their posterity. And archbishop Abbot, though under a cloud, ventured to write to the king upon the subject; beseeching him to consider, "whether by the toleration which his majesty proposes, he is not setting up that most damnable and heretical doctrine of the church of Rome, the whore of Babylon? How hateful must this be to God, and grievous to your good subjects (says he), that your majesty, who hath learnedly written against these wicked heresies, should now shew yourself a patron of those doctrines, which your pen has told the world, and your conscience tells yourself, are superstitious, idolatrous, and detestable.——Besides, this toleration, which you endeavour to set up by proclamation, cannot be done without a parliament, unless your majesty

* Rushworth, vol. 1 p. 60.

will let your subjects see that you will take a liberty to throw down the laws at your pleasure. And above all, I beseech your majesty to consider, lest by this toleration your majesty do not draw upon the kingdom in general, and on yourself in particular, God's heavy wrath and indignation."*

But this wise king, instead of hearkening to the remonstrances of his Protestant subjects, put the peace of his kingdom, and the whole Protestant religion, into the hands of the Spaniard, by sending his son with the duke of Buckingham to Madrid, to fetch home the infanta; a piece of confidence that the "Solomon of the age" should not have been guilty of. When the prince was gone, it is said, that Archy, the king's fool, clapped his cap upon the king's head. The king asking him the reason, he answered, because he had sent the prince into Spain. But, says his majesty, What if he should come back safe? Why then, says Archy, I will take my cap off from your head, and put it on the king of Spain's.† The Spaniards gave out, that the design of the prince's journey was to reconcile himself to the church of Rome. It is certain the pope wrote to the bishop of Conchen, to lay hold of this opportunity to convert him;‡ and directed a most persuasive letter to the prince himself to the same purpose, dated April 20, 1623, which the prince answered June 20, in a very obliging manner, giving the pope the title of Most Holy Father, and encouraging him to expect, that when he came to the crown there should be but one religion in his dominions, seeing, says he, that both Catholics and Protestants believe in one Jesus Christ. He was strongly solicited to change his religion by some of the first quality, and by the most learned priests and Jesuits, who caressed his highness with speeches, dedicated books to him, invited him to their processions, and gave him a view of their most magnificent churches and relics; by which artifices, though he was not converted, he was confirmed in his resolution of attempting a coalition of the two churches;§ for the

* Fuller, b. 10. p. 106. † Rapin, vol. 2. p. 226, the note, folio edit.

‡ Wilson, p. 230; Rapin, vol 2. p. 221, folio edit.

§ "This (says bishop Warburton) is an utter calumny; a coalition of the two churches was never in the king's thoughts; happy for him if he had never had worse; what he aimed at was arbitrary power." It is strange, how his lordship could give his pen a licence to pass this unjust censure on Mr. Neal: when the conduct of Charles I. furnished so many proofs of his wishes and endeavours to coalesce with the church of Rome. His letter to the pope from Madrid; the articles of the mar

attempting of which he afterward lost both his crown and life.* It was happy, after all, that the prince got safe out of the Spanish territories, which, as Spanheim observes, that politic court would not have permitted, had they not considered, that the queen of Bohemia, next heir to the crown, was a greater enemy to Popery than her brother.† But after all, when this memorable treaty of marriage had been upon the carpet seven years, and wanted nothing but celebration, the portion being settled, the pope's dispensation obtained, the marriage-articles sworn to on both sides, and the very day of consummation by proxy appointed, it was broke off by the influence of the duke of Buckingham upon the prince, who ordered the earl of Bristol not to deliver the proxy till the time limited by the dispensation was expired; the king of Spain, suspecting the design, in order to throw all the blame upon the king of England, signed a promise with his own hand, and delivered it to the ambassador, wherein he obliged himself to cause the Palatinate to be restored to the elector palatine, in case the marriage took effect; but his highness was immovable, and obliged the king to recall his ambassador.

---

riage-treaty to which he solemnly signed and swore; and the private articles to which he also swore, are witnesses to the truth of Mr. Neal's assertion. If he had not aimed at this, why did he disown the foreign Protestants? Why did he restrain the press with respect to books written against Popery, and license publications in favour of it? Why was Popery not only tolerated, but countenanced and favoured? See the facts to this purpose fully stated in Towgood's "Essay towards a true idea of the character of Charles I." chap. 9. So far did he carry his views and endeavours, on this business. Whitelocke informs us, a scheme was in agitation to set up a new Popish hierarchy by bishops in all the counties in England, by the authority of the pope. Memorials, p. 72. And the Jesuit Franciscus a Clara, the queen's chaplain, certainly thought things were in a train for such a *coalition*, for in one of his publications, he asserted, "that if any synod were held *inter catholicos et puritanos*, setting Puritans aside, our articles and their religion would soon be agreed." May's History of the Parliament, p. 74. Dr. Grey also aims to controvert this passage of Mr. Neal, and with this view refers us to Rushworth, Frankland, Hacket, and Burnet; but the quotations he adduces from these writers are not to the point: and prove only, as Mr. Neal allows, that Charles was not converted to Popery. See Dr. Grey's examination of Neal, vol. 2. p. 71.—Ed.

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 276, vide note, folio edit.

† Dr. Grey censures Mr. Neal for not quoting Spanheim fairly; and this writer, as Tyndal and Wodrow, from whom he borrows the passage, represent his words, does not, it is true, say that the queen of Bohemia was a greater enemy to Popery than her brother, but only resolves the conduct of the court of Spain into the consideration of her and her children being next heirs to the crown of England. Mr. Neal therefore is to be understood merely as suggesting the reason, why the consideration of her and her children had so much weight with the court of Spain. How who reflect on the firm attachment of that lady to the Protestant cause, will suspect Mr. Neal of mistaking the cause of the Spanish policy. It would have been, however, more accurate in him to have quoted at large the words of Spanheim, and then to have subjoined his own suggestion as explanatory of them. Ed.

From this time the prince and duke seemed to turn Puritans, the latter having taken Dr. John Preston, one of their chief ministers, into his service, to consult him about alienating the dean and chapter lands to the purpose of preaching. They also advised the king to convene a parliament, which his majesty did, and made such a speech to them, as one would think impossible to come from the same lips with the former. "I assure you (says he, speaking of the Spanish match), on the faith of a Christian king, that it is *res integra* presented unto you, and that I stand not bound nor either way engaged, but remain free to follow what shall be best advised." His majesty adds, "I can truly say, and will avouch it before the seat of God and angels, that never did king govern with a purer, sincerer, and more uncorrupt heart than I have done, far from ill-will and meaning of the least error and imperfection in my reign.——It has been talked of my remissness in maintenance of religion, and suspicion of a toleration [of Popery;*] but as God shall judge me, I never thought nor meant, nor ever in word expressed, any thing that savoured of it.—I never in all my treaties agreed to any thing to the overthrow and disannulling of those laws, but had in all a chief regard to the preservation of that truth which I have ever professed." The reader will remember how this agrees with the marriage-articles above mentioned, to which the king had sworn.

But the parliament, taking things as the king had represented them, advised his majesty to break off the match, and to declare war for the recovery of the Palatinate; and at the same time petitioned his majesty, that all Jesuits and seminary priests might be commanded to depart the realm; that the laws might be put in execution against Popish recusants; that all such might be removed from court, and ten miles from London.† To which the king made this remarkable answer, which must strike the reader with surprise and wonder,——What religion I am of my books declare; I wish it may be written in marble, and remain to posterity as a mark upon me, when I shall swerve from my religion; for he that dissembles with God is not to be trusted with men.——I protest before God, that my heart hath bled when I have heard of the increase of Popery. God is my judge,

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 227, 228, folio edit.
† Ibid. vol. 2. p. 229, 230, folio edit.; Rushworth, p. 141—143.

it hath been such a grief to me, that it hath been as thorns in my eyes and pricks in my sides.——It hath been my desire to hinder the growth of Popery; and I could not be an honest man, if I had done otherwise.——I will order the laws to be put in execution against Popish recusants, as they were before these treaties, for the laws are still in being, and were never dispensed with by me; God is my judge, they were never so intended by me."

What solemn appeals to heaven are these, against the clearest and most undeniable facts! It requires a good degree of charity, to believe this prince had either religion or conscience remaining. For though he assured his parliament, that his heart bled within him when he heard of the increase of Popery, yet this very parliament presented him with a list of fifty-seven Popish lords and knights who were in public offices, none of whom were displaced, while the Puritan ministers were driven out of the kingdom, and hardly a gentleman of that character advanced to the dignity of a justice of peace.

The parliament being prorogued, the king, instead of going heartily into the war, or marrying his son to a Protestant princess, entered into a treaty with Louis XIII. king of France, for his sister Henrietta Maria.* Upon this occasion the archbishop of Ambrun was sent into England, who told the king, the best way to accomplish the match for his son, was to grant a full toleration to Catholics. The king replied, that he intended to grant it, and was willing to have an assembly of divines to compromise the difference between Protestants and Papists, and promised to send a letter to the pope to bring him into the project. In this letter, says monsieur Deageant in his memoirs, the king styles the pope, Christ's vicar, and head of the church universal, and assures him, he would declare himself a Catholic as soon as he could provide against the inconveniences of such a declaration; but whether this was so or not, it is certain he immediately relaxed the penal laws against Papists, and permitted Ambrun to administer confirmation to ten thousand Catholics at the door of the French ambassador's house, in the presence of a great concourse of people. In the meantime the treaty of marriage went forwards, and was at last signed November 10, 1624, in the thirty-three public articles, and three secret ones, wherein the very same

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 231, 232, folio edit.

or greater advantages were stipulated for the Catholics than in those of Madrid;* but before the dispensation from the pope could be obtained, his majesty fell sick at Theobalds of a tertian ague, which put an end to his life, not without suspicion of poison, March 27, 1625, in the fifty-ninth year of his age.†

To review the course of this reign. It is evident that both Popery and Puritanism increased prodigiously, while the friends of the hierarchy sunk into contempt; this was owing partly to the spiritual promotions, and partly to the arbitrary maxims of state that the king had advanced. In promoting of bishops the king discovered a greater regard to such as would yield a servile compliance to his absolute commands, than to such as would fill their sees with reputation, and be an example to the people of religion and virtue, of which number were, bishop Neile, Buckeridge, Harsnet,‡ Laud, &c. The fashionable doctrines at court were such as the king had condemned at the synod of Dort, and which, in the opinion of the old English clergy, were subversive of the Reformation. The new bishops admitted the church of Rome to be a true church, and the pope the first bishop of Christendom. They declared for the lawfulness of images in churches; for the real presence; and that the doctrine of transubstantiation was a school nicety. They pleaded for confession to a priest; for sacerdotal absolution, and the proper merit of good works. They gave up the morality of the sabbath, and the five distinguishing points of Calvinism, for which their predecessors had contended. They claimed an uninterrupted succession of the episcopal character from the apostles through the church of Rome, which obliged them to maintain the validity of her ordinations, when they denied the validity of those of the foreign Protestants. Farther, they began to imitate the church of Rome in her gaudy ceremonies, in the rich furniture of their chapels, and the pomp of their worship.

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 233, 234.

† Rapin, p. 235; Welwood's Memoirs, 9th edit. p. 311, and Dr. Harris's Life of James I. p. 237–242.

‡ This prelate, bishop Warburton says, "was a man of the greatest learning and parts of his time." This he might be, and yet advanced but an account of his learning, but because his courtly dispositions recommended him to the royal taste. Fuller speaks of him "as a zealous asserter of ceremonies, owing to complain of conformable Puritans." So that the justness of his claims to be considered as a man of erudition being admitted, neither the candour or veracity of the historian, for classing him as he does, is impeached by it. Learning and soundness of mind are by no means inseparable.—Ed.

They complimented the Roman-Catholic priests with their dignitary titles, and spent all their zeal in studying how to compromise matters with Rome, while they turned their backs upon the old Protestant doctrines of the Reformation, and were remarkably negligent in preaching or instructing the people in Christian knowledge. Things were come to such a pass, that Gondamar the Spanish ambassador wrote to Spain, that there never were more hopes of England's conversion, for "there are more prayers (says he) offered to the Mother than to the Son [of God."*] The priests and Jesuits challenged the established clergy to public disputations; the duke of Buckingham's mother being a Papist, a conference was held in her presence between Fisher, a Jesuit, on the one part, and Dr. White, Williams, and Laud, on the other. Each of them disputed with the Jesuit a day before a great concourse of people, but not to the countess's conversion, which was not at all strange, upon their principles. Amongst other Popish books that were published, one was entitled, "A new gag for the old gospel;" which Dr. Montague, rector of Stamford-Rivers, answered in such a manner, as gave great offence to the old clergy, yielding up all the points above mentioned, and not only declaring for Arminianism, but making dangerous advances towards Popery itself. The book occasioning a great noise, Mr. Ward and Yates, two ministers at Ipswich, made a collection of the Popish and Arminian tenets it contained, in order to lay them before the next parliament; but the author, with the king's leave, took shelter under the royal wing, and prepared for the press his "Apello Cesarem," or a just appeal from two unjust informers; which White, bishop of Carlisle, licensed in these words, that "there was nothing contained in the same but what was agreeable to the public faith, doctrine, and discipline, established in the

* This is not a just or accurate representation of the words. As Rapin relates it; Gondamar, perceiving most addresses for preferment were made first to the mother of the marquis of Buckingham, and by her conveyed to her son, who could deny her nothing, amongst his other witty pranks, wrote merrily in his dispatches to Spain, "that never was there more hope of England's conversion to Rome than now; for there are more prayers offered here to the mother than to the son." The words, "of God," as bp. Warburton and Dr. Grey observe, should be erased. It was a mere joke of the Spanish ambassador, speaking of court-corruption under the terms of religion. Mr. Neal, by not referring to his authority, appears to quote it by recollection, and indeed to have mistaken the matter. Bishop Warburton is, however, very severe in his reflections on him, calling his statement of it "a vile perversion of facts." The reader will decide on his lordship's conduct here. Ed.

church of England." But before the book was published, the king died.

These advances of the court-divines towards Popery, made most of the people fall in with the Puritans, who, being constant preachers, and of exemplary lives, wrought them up by their awakening sermons to an abhorrence of every thing that looked that way.* Many of the nobility and gentry favoured them. Lady Bowes, afterward lady Darcy, gave 1,000*l.* per annum, to maintain preachers in the north, where there were none, and all her preachers were silenced Nonconformists. Almost all the famous practical writers of this reign, except bishop Andrews, were Puritans, and sufferers for nonconformity, as Dr. Willet, Mr. Jer. Dyke, Dr. Preston, Sibbs, Byfield, Bolton, Hildersham, Dod, Ball, Whately, and others, whose works have done great service to religion. The character of these divines was the reverse of what the learned Selden† gives of the clergy‡ of these times, in his "History of tithes," where he taxes them with ignorance and laziness; and adds, "that they had nothing to support their credit but beard, title, and habit; and that their learning reached no farther than the postils and the polyanthia." Upon the whole, if we may believe Mr. Coke, the Puritan party had gathered so much strength, and was in such reputation with the people, that they were more in number than all the other parties in the kingdom put together.

With regard to king James himself, it is hard to draw his just character, for no prince was ever so much flattered who so little deserved it. He was of a middle stature, not very corpulent, but stuffed out with clothes, which hung so

* Rothwell, p. 69, annexed to his General Martyrology.

† In Preface, p. 1. second edit. 1618.

‡ Bishop Warburton severely censures Mr. Neal for applying the words of Selden as if spoken of the episcopal clergy. "Here (says he) is another of the historian's arts; Selden speaks of the Puritan clergy." Not to urge in reply, that Selden can be understood as speaking of those clergy only, to whom his doctrine of tithes would be offensive, who could not be the Puritan clergy; it is fortunate for our author, that his interpretation of Selden's words is sanctioned by Heylin; who represents Selden's work as the execution of "a plot set on foot to subvert the church, in the undoing of the clergy. The author (he adds) was highly magnified, the book held unanswerable, and all the clergy looked on but as pigmies to that great Goliah." And then to shew, that the reproach cast on the clergy was not well founded, he appeals to the answers given to Selden by Nettles, fellow of Queen's college, Cambridge, Dr. Montague, and archdeacon Tillesly. "By which (says Heylin) he found that some of the ignorant and lazy clergy were of as retired studies as himself; and could not only match, but overmatch him too, in his philology." If Mr. Neal misrepresented Selden, so did Heylin. Heylin's Hist. of Presb. p. 391.—Ed.

loose, and being quilted, were so thick, as to resist a dagger. His countenance was homely, and his tongue too big for his mouth, so that he could not speak with decency. While he was in Scotland he appeared sober and chaste, and acquired a good degree of learning;* but, upon his accesion to the English crown, he threw off the mask, and by degrees gave himself up to luxury and ease, and all kinds of licentiousness. His language was obscene, and his actions very often lewd and indecent. He was a profane swearer, and would often be drunk, and when he came to himself would weep like a child, and say, he hoped God would not impute his infirmities to him. He valued himself upon what he called kingcraft, which was nothing else but deep hypocrisy and dissimulation in every character of life, resulting from the excessive timorousness of his nature. If we consider him as a king, he never did a great or generous action throughout the course of his reign,† but prostituted the honour of the English nation beyond any of his predecessors. He stood still while the Protestant religion was suppressed in France, in Bohemia, in the Palatinate, and other parts of Germany. He surrendered up the cautionary towns ‡ to the Dutch for less than a fourth part of the

*"His learning (observes Dr. Warner) was not that of a prince, but a pedant; and made him more fit to take the chair in public schools than to sit on the throne of kings." He was one of those princes "who (as bishop Shipley expresses it) were so unwise as to write books." The only thing that does him honour as an author is, that Mr. Pope pronounced his version of the psalms the very best in the English language. Warner's Eccles. Hist. vol. 2. p. 508.—Ed.

†To this, Dr. Grey opposes his bounty to the church of Ripon in Yorkshire, in which he founded a dean and chapter of seven prebendaries; and settled 247*l.* per annum of crown-lands for their maintenance. The doctor also quotes from Fuller, Wilson, and Laud, warm encomiums of his liberality. But it ought to be considered, whether a liberality, which did not, as Dr. Warner says, "flow from reason or judgment but from whim, or mere benignity of humours," deserved such praises. Besides, Mr. Neal evidently refers to "such great and generous actions," as advance the interest and prosperity of a kingdom, and add to the national honour. This cannot be said of favours bestowed on parasites and jovial companions; or on a provision made that a few clerical gentlemen may loll in stalls.—Ed.

‡These were the Brill and Flushing, with some other places of less note; and Dr. Grey, to screen the reputation of James from Mr. Neal's implied reflection, observes, that the Dutch had pawned those towns to queen Elizabeth for sums of money which she lent them, when they were distressed by the Spaniards. The sum borrowed on this security was eight millions of florins; and they were discharged for ten millions seven hundred and twenty-eight thousand florins, though eighteen years' interest was due. In equity and by stipulation the Dutch had a right, on repaying the money, to reclaim the towns they had mortgaged. This Dr Grey must be understood as insinuating, by setting up the fact of the mortgage in defence of James's character. Yet, in all just estimation, his character must ever suffer by his surrender of those towns. He restored them without an equivalent, and without the advice or consent of parliament, to raise money to

value, and suffered them to dispossess us of our factories in the East Indies. At home he committed the direction of all affairs in church and state to two or three favourites, and cared not what they did if they gave him no trouble. He broke through all the laws of the land, and was as absolute a tyrant as his want of courage would admit.* He revived the projects of monopolies, loans, benevolences, &c. to supply his exchequer, which was exhausted by his profuseness towards his favourites, and laid the foundation of all the calamities of his son's reign. Upon the whole, though he was flattered by hungry courtiers as the Solomon and phœnix of his age, he was, in the opinion of bishop Burnet, "the scorn of the age, a mere pedant, without true judgment, courage, or steadiness, his reign being a continued course of mean practices."

It is hard to make any judgment of his religion; for one while he was a Puritan, and then a zealous churchman; at first a Calvinist and Presbyterian, afterward a Remonstrant or Arminian, and at last a half, if not an entire, doctrinal Papist. Sir Ralph Winwood, in his Memoirs, says, that as long ago as the year 1596, he sent Mr. Ogilby, a Scots baron, to Spain, to assure his Catholic majesty he was then ready to turn Papist, and to propose an alliance with that king and the pope against the queen of England; but for reasons of state the affair was hushed. Rapin says, he was neither a sound Protestant, nor a good Catholic, but had formed a plan of uniting both churches, which must effectually have ruined the Protestant interest, for which indeed he never expressed any real concern. But I am rather of opinion that all his religion was his boasted kingcraft. He was certainly the meanest prince that ever sat on the British throne.† England never sunk in its reputation nor was

---

lavish on his favourites. And by this step he lost the dependance those provinces before had on the English crown. See this matter fully stated in Rapin's History, vol. 2. p. 122. and 191, 192; and by Dr. Harris in his Life of James I. p. 162—167. —Ed.

* In his book, entitled, "The true law of free monarchy," he asserted, that "the parliament is nothing else but the head court of the king and his vassals; that the laws are but craved by his subjects; and that, in short, he is above the law." This is a proof that his speculative notions of regal power were, as Mr. Granger expresses it, "as absolute as those of an eastern monarch." Secret History of Charles II. vol. 1. Introduc. p. 20. the note.— Ed.

† To Mr. Neal's character of James, Dr. Grey particularly opposes that drawn of him by the pen of Spotswood, who was preferred by him to the archbishopric of

so much exposed to the scorn and ridicule of its neighbours, as in his reign. How willing his majesty was to unite with the Papists, the foregoing history has discovered; and yet in the presence of many lords, and in a very remarkable manner, he made a solemn protestation, "that he would spend the last drop of blood in his body before he would do it; and prayed, that before any of his issue should maintain any other religion than his own [the Protestant] that God would take them out of the world." How far this imprecation took place on himself, or any of his posterity, I leave, with Mr. archdeacon Echard, to the determination of an omniscient Being.*

CHAP. III.

FROM THE DEATH OF KING JAMES I. TO THE DISSOLUTION OF THE THIRD PARLIAMENT OF KING CHARLES I. IN THE YEAR 1628.

Before we enter upon this reign, it will be proper to take a short view of the court, and of the most active ministers under the king for the first fifteen years.

King Charles I. came to the crown at the age of twenty-five years, being born at Dumferling in Scotland, in the year 1600, and baptized by a Presbyterian minister of that country. In his youth, he was of a weakly constitution, and

St. Andrews. "In this, Dr. Harris (says Grey) did not quite so right. For court-bishops, by some fate or other, from the time of Constantine, down at least to the death of James, and a little after, have had the characters of flatterers, panegyrists, and others of like import; and therefore are always to have great abatements made in the accounts of their benefactors; it being well known that such they endeavour to hand down to posterity under the notion of saints, as they always blacken and deface their adversaries." Life of James I. p. 216, 217.—Ed.

* The reader will be pleased to hear the sentiments of a learned foreigner on the reign and character of king James. The same bias will not be imputed to him as to Mr. Neal. "In this year 1625 died James I. the bitterest enemy of the doctrine and discipline of the Puritans, to which he had been in his youth most warmly attached; the most inveterate and violent friend of the Arminians, to whose ruin and condemnation in Holland he had been singularly instrumental; and the most zealous defender of episcopal government, against which he had more than once expressed himself in the strongest terms. He left the constitution of England, both ecclesiastical and civil, in a very unsettled and fluctuating state, languishing under intestine disorders of various kinds." Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, translated by Maclaine, second edit. vol. 4 p. 317, 318.—Ed.

stammering speech; his legs were somewhat crooked, and he was suspected (says Mr. Echard) to be of a perverse nature. When his father [king James] came to the English crown, he took him from his Scots tutors, and placed him under those who gave him an early aversion to that kirk, into which he had been baptized,* and to those doctrines of Christianity which they held in the greatest veneration. As the court of king James leaned towards Popery† and arbitrary power, so did the prince, especially after his journey into Spain; where he imbibed not only the pernicious maxims of that court, but their reserved and distant behaviour.‡ He assured the pope by letter, in order to obtain a

* The expression here, whether it be Mr. Neal's own or that of any writer of the times, is inaccurate, improper, and proceeds upon a wrong notion of the design of baptism. This rite, resting solely on the authority of Christ, refers not to the peculiar sentiments of the church, or the particular party of Christians, amongst whom a person may happen to have it administered to him. It expresseth a profession of Christianity only, and refers exclusively to the authority of its Author, acting in the name of God the Father, and having his ministry sealed by the gifts of the Holy Spirit. The notion of being baptized into the kirk of Scotland, or into the church of England, is entirely repugnant to the reasoning of Paul in 1 Cor. i. who, as Dr. Clarke expresses, "we find was very careful, was very solicitous, not to give any occasion to have it thought, that there was any such thing as the doctrine of Paul, much less any such thing as the doctrine of the church of Corinth or Rome, or of any other than Christ only—in whose name only we were baptized." Clarke's Sermons, vol. 4. p. 95. 8vo.—Ed.

† Dr. Grey controverts this assertion of Mr. Neal, and calls it "groundless;" with a view to confute it, he quotes Rymer, Clarendon, and bishop Fleetwood. The first and last authorities go to prove only the king's firm adherence to Protestantism and the church of England, so far as concerned his own personal profession of religion; the former alleges that the attempt of the court of Spain to convert him to Popery was inefficient; the latter is only a pulpit eulogium to the memory of Charles on the 30th of January. The quotation from lord Clarendon, apparently proves more than these authorities; for it asserts, "that no man was more averse from the Romish church than he [i. e. king Charles] was." But, to be consistent with himself, his lordship must be understood with a limitation; as speaking of his remoteness from a conformity to Popery in his own belief and practice; not of his disposition towards that religion, as professed by others. Dr. Harris has produced many proofs, that the king was not a Papist himself. But he has also evinced, by many authorities, that professed Papists were favoured, caressed, and preferred at court. The articles of the marriage-treaty, to which he signed and solemnly swore, sanctioned the profession of that religion in his kingdom. The clergy, who enjoyed the smiles of the court, pronounced in favour of the practices and tenets of Popery. And Popish covenants were not only tolerated, but protected by this prince. See Harris's Life of Charles I. p. 198 to 204, and from p. 204 to 208. The facts of this nature are also amply stated in "An essay towards attaining a true idea of the character and reign of king Charles I." chap. 9. On these grounds Mr. Neal is fully vindicated; for he speaks, it should be observed, not of the king's being a Papist, but of his "leaning towards Popery." But it might be sufficient to quote, against Dr. Grey, even lord Clarendon only, who tells us, "that the Papists were upon the matter, absolved from the severest parts of the law, and dispensed with for the gentlest. They were looked upon as good subjects at court, and as good neighbours in the country; all the restraints and reproaches of time or times being forgotten." His lordship expatiates largely on the favours they received, and on the boldness they assumed. History of the Rebellion, vol. 1. p. 140, 8vo. edit. of 1707.—Ed.

‡ In confutation of this assertion, Dr. Grey quotes Rushworth; who says, that at the court of Spain "prince Charles gained a universal love, and earned it, from first

dispensation to marry the infanta, "that he would not marry any mortal whose religion he hated: he might therefore depend upon it, that he would always abstain from such actions as might testify a hatred to the Roman-Catholic religion, and would endeavour that all sinister opinions might be taken away; that as we all profess one individual Trinity, we may unanimously grow up into one faith." His majesty began his reign upon most arbitrary principles, and though he had good natural abilities, was always under the direction of some favourite, to whose judgment and conduct he was absolutely resigned. Nor was he ever master of so much judgment in politics, as to discern his own and the nation's true interest, or to take the advice of those who did. With regard to the church, he was a punctual observer of its ceremonies, and had the highest dislike and prejudice to that part of his subjects who were against the ecclesiastical constitution, "looking upon them as a very dangerous and seditious people, who would under pretence of conscience, which kept them from submitting to the spiritual jurisdiction, take the first opportunity they could find or make (says lord Clarendon*), to withdraw themselves from his temporal jurisdiction; and therefore his majesty caused this people [the Puritans] to be watched and provided against with the utmost vigilance."

Upon his majesty's accession, and before the solemnity of his father's funeral, he married Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henry IV. and sister of Lewis XIII. then king of France. The marriage was solemnized by proxy; first at Paris, with all the ceremonies of the Romish church, and afterward at Canterbury, according to the rites of the church of England; the articles being in a manner the same with those already mentioned in the Spanish match. Her majesty arrived at Dover, June 13, 1625, and brought with her a long train of priests and menial servants of the Romish religion; for whose devotion a chapel was fitted up in the king's house at

to last, with the greatest affability." The doctor did not observe that his authority was not to the point, for Mr. Neal speaks of Charles's deportment after he had been in Spain, and of his general temper. Rushworth's delineation is confined to his conduct at court, where he was treated with all imaginable respect; and when the object of his visit would of course animate a youth to good-humour, politeness, and gallantry. Mr. Neal is fully supported by many authorities, which the reader may see collected by Dr. Harris, p. 68 [illegible], and an essay towards attaining a true idea, &c, chap. 1. [illegible]

* Clarendon, vol 1. p 81.

St. James's. "The queen was an agreeable and beautiful lady, and by degrees (says lord Clarendon) obtained a plenitude of power over the king.——His majesty had her in perfect adoration,* and would do nothing without her, but was inexorable as to every thing that he promised her." Bishop Burnet says, "the queen was a lady of great vivacity, and loved intrigues of all sorts, but was not secret in them as she ought; she had no manner of judgment, being bad at contrivance, but worse at execution. By the liveliness of her discourse, she made great impressions upon the king; so that to the queen's little practice, and the king's own temper, the sequel of all his misfortunes were owing." Bishop Kennet adds; "that the king's match with this lady, was a greater judgment to the nation than the plague, which then raged in the land; for considering the malignity of the Popish religion, the imperiousness of the French government, the influence of a stately queen over an affectionate husband, and the share she must needs have in the education of her children [till thirteen years of age], it was then easy to foresee it might prove very fatal to our English prince and people, and lay in a vengeance to future generations." The queen was a very great bigot to her religion;† her conscience was directed by her confessor, assisted by the pope's nuncio, and a secret cabal of priests and Jesuits. These controlled the queen, and she the king; so that in effect the nation was governed by Popish councils, till the long parliament.

The prime minister under the king was G. Villiers duke of Buckingham, a graceful young gentleman, but very unfit for his high station. He had full possession of the king's heart, insomuch that his majesty broke measures with all his parliaments for his sake. "Most men (says lord Clarendon‡) imputed all the calamities of the nation to his arbitrary councils; so that few were displeased at the news of his murder by Felton, in the year 1628, when he was not above thirty-four years of age."

* "Whoever sees her charming portrait at Windsor (says *Mr. Granger*) will cease to admire at her great influence over the king." The Biographical History of England, vol. 2. p. 96, 8vo.—Ed.

† As the demand to have the solemnity of the coronation performed by the bishops of her own religion was refused, and such was her bigotry it would not permit her to join in our church-ceremonies; she appeared therefore as a spectator only on that occasion. Granger, as before, vol. 2. p. 96, note.—Ed.

‡ Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 037.

Upon the duke's death, Dr. William Laud, then bishop of London, became the chief minister both in church and state.* He was born at Reading, and educated in St. John's college, Oxford, upon the charitable donation of Mr. White, founder of Merchant-Taylors' school. Here he continued till he was fifty years of age, and behaved in such a manner that nobody knew what to think of him. "I would I knew (says the pious bishop Hall in one of his letters) where to find you: to-day you are with the Romanists, to-morrow with us; our adversaries think you ours, and we theirs; your conscience finds you with both and neither: how long will you halt in this indifferency?" Dr. Abbot says, "He spent his time in picking quarrels with the lectures of public readers, and giving advice to the then bishop of Durham, that he might fill the ears of the king [James I.] with prejudices against honest men, whom he called Puritans."† Heylin confesses it was thought dangerous to keep him company. By the interest of bishop Williams, he was first advanced‡ to a Welch bishoprick, and from thence by degrees to the highest preferments in church and state. He was a little man, of a quick and rough temper, impatient of contradiction even at the council-table, of arbitrary principles both in church and state, always inclined to methods of severity, especially against the Puritans; vastly fond of external pomp and ceremony in divine worship; and though he was not an absolute Papist, he was ambitious of being the sovereign patriarch of three kingdoms.§

Lord-chief-justice Finch was a man of little knowledge in his profession, except it was for making the laws of the

* "As to his preferments in the state (says Dr. Grey), I should be glad to know what they were." Though the doctor, who was ignorant of them, is now out of the reach of a reply; for the information of the reader they shall be mentioned. In 1635 he was put into the great committee of trade; and on the death of the earl of Portland, was made one of the commissioners of the treasury and revenue; "which (says lord Clarendon) he had reason to be sorry for, because it engaged him in civil business and matters of state." History of the Rebellion, vol. 1. p. 98, 8vo. 1707. British Biography, vol. 4. p. 209.—Ed.

† Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 111.

‡ To refute this account of the cause of Laud's preferment, Dr. Grey quotes Mr. Wharton. The circumstance in itself is of no importance to the credit or design of Mr. Neal's history. And the passage even admits the fact that Laud owed his preferments to bishop Williams's solicitations, on the authority of Laud's diary, and bishop Hacket, Williams's biographer; but the drift of Mr. Wharton is to exculpate Laud from the charge of ingratitude to bishop Williams on this ground: that the latter, in the service he rendered the former, was not actuated by kindness, but by selfish and interested views. This does not confute, in any degree, Mr. Neal, who says nothing about the motives by which bishop Williams was governed.—Ed.

§ Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 98.

land give place to orders of council. Mr. attorney-general Noy* was a man of affected pride and morosity, who valued himself (says lord Clarendon†) upon making that to be law which all other men believed not to be so. Indeed, all the judges were of this stamp, who instead of upholding the law, as the defence and security of the subjects' privileges, set it aside upon every little occasion, distinguishing between a rule of law, and a rule of government: so that those whom they could not convict by statute law, were sure to suffer by the rule of government, or a kind of political justice. The judges held their places during the king's pleasure; and when the prerogative was to be stretched in any particular instances, Laud would send for their opinions beforehand, to give the greater sanction to the proceedings of the council and star-chamber, by whom they were often put in mind, that if they did not do his majesty's business to satisfaction, they would be removed. Upon the whole, they were mercenary men, and (according to lord Clarendon) scandalous to their profession.

The courts of Westminster-hall had little to do between the crown and the subject; all business of this kind being transferred to the council-table, the star-chamber, and the court of high commission.

The council-table was the legislature of the kingdom; their proclamations and orders being made a rule of government, and the measure of the subject's obedience. Though there was not one single law enacted in twelve years, there were no less than two hundred and fifty proclamations; every one of which had the force of a law, and bound the subject under the severest penalties. The lord-keeper Finch, upon a demurrer put into a bill that had no other equity than an order of council, declared upon the bench, that while he was keeper, no man should be so saucy as to dispute those orders, but that the wisdom of that board should always be ground good enough for him to make a decree in chancery. Judge Berkeley, upon a like occasion, declared, that there was a rule of law, and a rule of government, that many things that might not be done by the rule of law, might be done by the rule of government:‡ his

* Bishop Warburton censures Mr. Neal, for not informing his reader that Noy was a great lawyer.

† Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 71, 73, 74.

‡ Ibid. vol. 1. p. 74.

lordship added, that no act of parliament could bind the king not to command away his subjects' goods and money.

"The star-chamber (says lord Clarendon*) was in a manner the same court with the council-table, being but the same persons in several rooms: they were both grown into courts of law, to determine right; and courts of revenue, to bring money into the treasury: the council-table by proclamations enjoining to the people what was not enjoined by law, and prohibiting that which was not prohibited; and the star-chamber censuring the breach and disobedience to those proclamations, by very great fines and imprisonment; so that any disrespect to any acts of state, or to the persons of statesmen, was in no time more penal, and those foundations of right, by which men valued their security, were never in more danger of being destroyed.

"The high-commission also had very much overflowed the banks that should have contained it, not only in meddling with things not within their cognizance, but in extending their sentences and judgments beyond that degree that was justifiable, and grew to have so great a contempt of the common law, and the professors of it, that prohibitions from the supreme courts of law, which have and must have the superintendency over all the inferior courts, were not only neglected, but the judges were reprehended for granting them, which without perjury, they could not deny.† ——Besides, from an ecclesiastical court for reformation of manners, it was grown to a court of revenue, and imposed great fines upon those who were culpable before them; sometimes above the degree of the offence, had the jurisdiction of fining been unquestionable, which it was not; which course of fining was much more frequent, and the fines heavier, after the king had granted all that revenue for the reparation of St. Paul's which made the grievance greater;" and gave occasion to an unlucky observation, that the church was built with the sins of the people. These commissioners, not content with the business that was brought before them, sent their commissaries over the whole kingdom to superintend the proceedings of the bishops' courts in their several dioceses, which of themselves made sufficient havoc among the Puritans, and were under a general

* Clarendon, p. 60 69. † Ibid p. 283.

odium for the severe exercise of their power: but if the bishop or his officers were negligent in their citations, or shewed any degree of favour to the Puritan ministers, notice was immediately sent to Lambeth, and the accused persons were cited before the high-commission, to their utter ruin. They also detained men in prison many months, without bringing them to a trial, or so much as acquainting them with the cause of their commitment. Sir Edward Deering says, that "their proceedings were in some sense worse than the Romish inquisition, because they do not punish men of their own religion established by law; but with us (says he) how many scores of poor distressed ministers, within a few years, have been suspended, degraded, and excommunicated, though not guilty of a breach of any established law!" All which was so much the worse, because they knew that the court had no jurisdiction of fining at all; for the house of commons, in the third and seventh of king James I. resolved, that the court of high commission's fining and imprisoning men for ecclesiastical offences, was an intolerable grievance, oppression, and vexation, not warranted by the statute 1 Eliz. chap. 1. And sir Edward Coke, with the rest of the judges, at a conference with the prelates, in the presence of king James, gave it as their unanimous opinion, that the high-commission could fine in no case, and imprison only in cases of heresy and incontinence of a minister, and that only after conviction, but not by way of process before it, so that the jurisdiction of the court to fine was not only questionable, but null and void. Notwithstanding which, they hunted after their prey with full cry, "and brought in the greatest and most splendid transgressors: persons of honour and great quality (says the noble historian) were every day cited into the high-commission, upon the fame of their incontinency, or scandal of life, and very heavy fines were levied upon them, and applied to the repairing of St. Paul's cathedral."

Upon the accession of king Charles to the throne, the duke of Buckingham threw off the mask, and shook hands with his old friend Dr. Preston, whom he never loved any farther than as a tool to promote his interest among the people. Laud was his confessor and privy-counsellor for the church, whose first care was to have none but Arminian and anti-Puritanical chaplains about the king: for this pur-

pose, he drew up a small treatise and put it into the duke's hand, proving the Arminian doctrines to be orthodox; and shewing, in ten particulars, that the anti-Arminian tenets were no better than Doctrinal Puritanism. Agreeably to the scheme, he presented the duke [April 9] with a list of divines for his majesty's chaplains, distinguishing their characters by the two capital letters, O. for Orthodox [that is, Arminian], and P. for Puritans [that is, Calvinists]. At the same time he received orders to consult bishop Andrews how to manage, with respect to the five distinguishing points of Calvinism, in the ensuing convocation; but the wise bishop advised his brother by all means to be quiet, and keep the controversy out of the house: "for (says he) the truth in this point is not so generally entertained among the clergy; nor is archbishop Abbot, nor many of the prelates, so inclinable to it, as to venture the deciding it in convocation." It was therefore wisely dropped, the majority of the lower house being zealous Calvinists; and forty-five of them (according to Dr. Leo, who was one of the number) had made a covenant among themselves to oppose every thing that tended towards Pelagianism, or semi-Pelagianism: but the controversy was warmly debated without doors, till the king put a stop to it by his royal declaration.

Popery advanced hand in hand with Arminianism, and began the disputes between the king and his first parliament, which met June 16, 1625. His majesty, towards the close of his speech, having asked their assistance for the recovery of the Palatinate, assured them that, though he had been suspected as to his religion, he would let the world see, that none should be more desirous to maintain the religion he professed than himself. The houses thanked the king for his most gracious speech; but before they entered upon other business, joined in a petition against Popish recusants, which his majesty promised to examine, and give a satisfactory answer to the particulars.

The petition sets forth the causes of the increase of Popery, with the remedies: the causes are,

The want of the due execution of the laws against them. The interposing of foreign powers by their ambassadors and agents in their favour. The great concourse of Papists to the city, and their frequent conferences and conventicles there. Their open resort to the chapels of foreign ambas-

sadors. The education of their children in foreign seminaries. The want of sufficient instruction in the Protestant religion in several places of the country. The licentious printing of Popish books. The employment of men ill-affected to the Protestant religion in places of government.*

They therefore pray that the youth of the kingdom may be carefully educated under Protestant schoolmasters; which his majesty, in his answer to their petition, promised: That the ancient discipline of the universities may be restored; which his majesty approved: That the preaching of the word of God may be enlarged; and that to this purpose the bishops be advised to make use of the labours of such able ministers as have been formerly silenced, advising and beseeching them to behave themselves peaceably; and that pluralities, nonresidences, and commendams, may be moderated. Answer, "This his majesty approved, so far as the ministers would conform to church-government. But he apprehends that pluralities, &c. are now so moderated, that there is no room for complaint; and recommends it to the parliament to take care that every parish allow a competent maintenance for an able minister." That provision might be made against transporting children to Popish seminaries, and for recalling those that were there. Answ. "To this his majesty agreed." That no Popish recusant be admitted to come to court, but upon special occasion, according to statute 3 Jac. Answ. "This also his majesty promised." That the laws against Papists be put in execution, and that a day be fixed for the departure of all Jesuits and seminary-priests out of the kingdom, and that no natural-born subject, nor strange bishops, nor any other by authority from the see of Rome, confer any ecclesiastical orders, or exercise any ecclesiastical function, upon your majesty's subjects. Answ. "It shall be so published by proclamation." That your majesty's learned council may have orders to consider of all former grants of recusant lands, that such may be avoided as are avoidable by law. Answ. "It shall be done according as is desired. That your majesty give order to your judges and all officers of justice, to see the laws against Popish recusants duly executed. Answ. "His majesty leaves the laws to their course." That your majesty will remove from places of authority and government all

* Rushworth, p. 103—106.

Popish recusants. Answ. "His majesty will give order accordingly." That order be taken for disarming all Popish recusants convict according to law, and that Popish recusants be commanded to retire to their houses, and be confined within five miles of home. Answ. "The laws shall be put in execution." That none of your majesty's natural-born subjects go to hear mass at the houses or chapels of foreign ambassadors. Answ. "The king will give order accordingly." That the statute of 1 Eliz. for the payment of twelvepence every Sunday by such as absent from divine service in the church without a lawful excuse, be put in execution. Answ. "The king promises the penalties shall not be dispensed with." That your majesty will extend your princely care to Ireland, that the like courses may be taken there for establishing the true religion. Answ. "His majesty will do all that a religious king can do in that affair."*

It is surprising that the king should make these promises to his parliament within six months after he had signed his marriage-articles, in which he had engaged to set all Roman Catholics at liberty, and to suffer no search or molestation of them for their religion, and had in consequence of it pardoned twenty Romish priests, and (in imitation of his royal father) given orders to his lord-keeper to direct the judges and justices of peace all over England, "to forbear all manner of proceedings against his Roman-Catholic subjects, by information, indictment, or otherwise; it being his royal pleasure that there should be a cessation of all and singular pains and penalties whereunto they were liable by any laws, statutes, or ordinances, of this realm."† But, as a judicious writer observes,‡ it seems to have been a maxim in this and the last reign, that no faith is to be kept with parliaments. The Papists were apprized of the reasons of state that obliged the king to comply outwardly with what he did not really intend; and therefore, though his majesty

* Rushworth, p. 173. † The remark of Dr. Warner here is too pertinent and forcible, especially considering from whose pen it comes, to be omitted. "These gracious answers of his majesty (says he) to the several articles of the petition presented to him by both houses of parliament, wanted nothing but the performance of the promises which he made, to gain him the love of all his Protestant subjects. But if we may judge by the continual complaints of the parliament throughout this reign, about these very points on which the king had given this full fashion, we shall find reason to think, that his promises were observed no better than James his father observed his." Warner's Eccles. Hist. vol. 2. p. 21 Ed.

‡ Rapin.

directed a letter to his archbishop [December 15, 1625], to proceed against Popish recusants, and a proclamation was published to recall the English youths from Popish seminaries, little regard was paid to them. The king himself released eleven Romish priests out of prison, by special warrant the next day; the titular bishop of Chalcedon, by letters dated June 1, 1625, appointed a Popish vicar-general and archdeacons all over England,* whose names were published in the year 1643.† And when the next parliament petitioned for the removal of Papists from offices of trust, it appeared, by a list annexed to their petition, that there were no less than fifty-nine of the nobility and gentry of that religion then in the commission.‡

But the king not only connived at the Roman Catholics at home, but unhappily contributed to the ruin of the Protestant religion abroad. Cardinal Richlieu having formed a design to extirpate the Hugonots of France, by securing all their places of strength, laid siege to Rochelle, a seaport town with a good harbour, and a number of ships sufficient for its defence. Richlieu, taking advantage of the king's late match with France, sent to borrow seven or eight ships, to be employed as the king of France should direct, who appointed them to block up the harbour of Rochelle; but when the honest sailors were told where they were going, they declared they would rather be thrown overboard, or hanged upon the top of the masts, than fight against their Protestant brethren. Notwithstanding admiral Pennington and the French officers used all their rhetoric to persuade them, they remained inflexible. The admiral therefore acquainted the king, who sent him a warrant to the following effect: "That he should consign his own ship immo-

* Fuller tells us, that this titular bishop of Chalcedon, whose name was Smith, appeared in his pontificalibus in Lancashire, with his mitre and crosier. This was an evident proof, that the Catholics presumed on the indulgence and connivance, if not the protection, of the court. To shew which, the fact is brought forward by Mr. Neal; whose candour in this matter Dr. Grey impeaches, because he does not inform his reader, that the king issued a proclamation for apprehending this Romish agent. But it seems to have escaped Dr. Grey's attention, that a proclamation not issued till the 11th of December 1628, and not then, till drawn from him by a petition of both houses against recusants, can have little weight against the imputation on the king, which this fact is alleged to support. Rushworth's Collection, vol. 1. p. 511.—Ed.

† Rushworth, p. 158, 159, and Fuller's Church Hist. b. 11. p. 192, 193.

‡ See Rushworth's Collection, vol. 1. p. 394, &c. The names of some of these persons perhaps were returned only on the ground of suspicion; because their wives and children were of the Romish communion, or did not come to church. "Mr. Neal," therefore, according to Dr. Grey, "mistook Rushworth."—Ed.

diately into the hands of the French admiral, with all their equipage, artillery, &c. and require the other seven to put themselves, into the service of our dear brother the French king; and in case of backwardness or refusal, we command you to use all forcible means, even to their sinking." In pursuance of this warrant, the ships were delivered into the hands of the French, but all the English sailors and officers deserted except two. The French having got the ships and artillery, quickly manned them with sailors of their own religion, and joining the rest of the French fleet, they blocked up the harbour, destroyed the little fleet of the Rochellers, and cut off their communication by sea with their Protestant friends, by which means they were reduced to all the hardships of a most dreadful famine; and after a long blockade both by sea and land, were forced to surrender the chief bulwark of the Protestant interest in France, into the hands of the Papists.

To return to the parliament. It has been remembered, that Mr. Richard Montague, a clergyman, and one of the king's chaplains, published a book in the year 1623, entitled, "A new gag for an old goose," in answer to a Popish book, entitled, "A gag for the new gospel."* The book containing sundry propositions tending to the public disturbance, was complained of in the house of commons, who, after having examined the author at their bar, referred him to the archbishop of Canterbury, who dismissed him with an express prohibition to write no more about such matters. But Montague, being encouraged from court, went on and published "An appeal to Cæsar," designing it for king James; but he being dead before it was ready, it was dedicated to king Charles, and recommended at first by several court-bishops, who upon better consideration artfully withdrew their names from before it; and left Dr. Francis White to appear by himself, as he complained publicly. The appeal was calculated to promote Arminianism, to attempt a reconciliation with Rome, and to advance the king's prerogative above law. The house appointed a committee to examine into its errors; after which they voted it to be contrary to the articles of the church of England, and bound the author in a recognizance of 2,000*l.* for his appearance.

* Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 177.

Bishop Laud, apprehending this to be an invasion of the prerogative, and a dangerous precedent, joined with two other bishops in a letter to the duke of Buckingham, to engage his majesty to take the cause into his own hands: the letter says,* "that the church of England when it was reformed would not be too busy with school-points of divinity; now the points for which Mr. Montague is brought into trouble, are of this kind; some are the resolved doctrines of the church of England, which he is bound to maintain; and others are fit only for schools, wherein men may abound in their own sense. To make men subscribe school-opinions is hard, and was one great fault of the council of Trent. Besides, disputes about doctrines in religion ought to be determined in a national synod or convocation, with the king's licence, and not in parliament; if we submit to any other judge, we shall depart from the ordinance of Christ, we shall derogate from the honour of the late king, who saw and approved of all the opinions in that book; as well as from his present majesty's royal prerogative, who has power and right to take this matter under his own care, and refer it in a right course to church-consideration. Some of the opinions which are opposite to Mr. Montague's will prove fatal to the government, if publicly taught and maintained: when they had been concluded upon at Lambeth, queen Elizabeth caused them to be suppressed, and so they continued, till of late some of them received countenance from the synod of Dort; a synod, whose conclusions have no authority in this country, and it is to be hoped never will." Signed, Jo. Roffensis, Jo. Oxon, and Gulielmus Menevensis, August 2, 1625.

This letter had its effect, and procured Montague his *quietus* at present. The king declared he would bring the cause before the council, it being a branch of his supremacy to determine matters of religion. He expressed his displeasure against the commons, for calling his chaplain to their bar, and for alarming the nation with the danger of Popery. But these affairs, with the king's assisting at the siege of Rochelle, made such a noise at Oxford; where the parliament was reassembled because of the plague at London, that the king was obliged to dissolve them [August 12], before they had granted the supplies necessary for carrying

* Cabala, p. 105; Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 180, 181; or, 110, 111, of the edit. in 1663.

on the war. Nor did his majesty pass any act relating to religion, except one, which was soon after suspended by his royal declaration; it was to prevent unlawful pastimes on the Lord's day. The preamble sets forth, that the holy keeping of the Lord's day is a principal part of the true service of God—"Therefore it is enacted that there shall be no assemblies of people out of their own parishes, for any sports or pastimes whatsoever; nor any bear-baiting, bull-baiting, interludes, common plays, or any other unlawful exercises or pastimes, within their own parishes, on forfeiture of three shillings and sixpence for every such offence to the poor." However, this law was never put in execution. Men were reproached and censured for too strict an observation of the Lord's day, but none that I have met with for the profanation of it.

His majesty having dismissed his parliament before they had given him the necessary supplies for the war with Spain, resolved to try his credit in borrowing money, by way of loan, of such persons as were best able to lend; for this purpose gentlemen were taxed at a certain sum, and had promissory letters under the privy seal to be repayed in eighteen months.* With this money the king fitted out a fleet against Spain, which, after it had waited about two months for the Plate fleet, returned without doing any action worth remembrance.

The ceremony of the king's coronation, which was not performed till the beginning of February, was another expense which his majesty thought fit to provide for by issuing out a proclamation, that all such as had 40*l.* a year or more, and were not yet knights, should come and receive the order of knighthood, or compound for it.† This was a new grievance loudly complained of in the following parliaments. The coronation was performed by archbishop Abbot, assisted by bishop Laud as dean of Westminster,‡ who besides the old regalia which were in his custody, that is, the crown, the sceptre, the spurs, &c. of king Edward the Confessor, brought forth an old crucifix, and placed it upon the altar. As soon as the archbishop had put the

* Rushworth, vol. 1 p. 196, 197. † Rapin, vol. 2. p. 538, 611, folio ed.

‡ Dr. Grey properly corrects Mr. Neal here: Laud officiated in the place of the dean of Westminster, the bishop of Lincoln, with whom the king was so displeased, that he would not permit him to perform any part of the coronation service. Fuller's Church Hist. b. 10. p. 131. Ed.

crown upon the king's head, and performed the other usual ceremonies,* his majesty being seated on the throne, ready to receive the homage of the lords, bishop Laud came up to him, and read the following extraordinary passage, which is not to be found in former coronations. "Stand, and hold fast from henceforth the place to which you have been heir by the succession of your forefathers, being now delivered to you by the authority of Almighty God, and by the hands of us, and all the bishops and servants of God. And as you see the clergy to come nearer to the altar than others, so remember, that in all places convenient you give them greater honour, that the Mediator of God and man may establish you in the kingly throne, to be a mediator between the clergy and the laity, and that you may reign for ever with Jesus Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords."† This and sundry other alterations were objected to the archbishop at his trial, which we shall mention hereafter.

The king's treasury being exhausted, and the war continuing with Spain, his majesty was obliged to call a new parliament; but to avoid the choice of such members, as had exclaimed against the duke of Buckingham, and insisted upon redress of grievances, the court pricked them down for sheriffs, which disqualified them from being rechosen members of parliament; of this number were, sir Edward Coke, sir Robert Philips, and sir Thomas Wentworth, afterward lord Strafford. The houses met February 6, 1626, and fell immediately upon grievances. A committee for religion was appointed, of which Mr. Pym was chairman, who examined Mr. Montague's writings, viz. his "Gag," his "Appeal," and his treatise of the "Invocation of the saints;" out of which they collected several opinions contrary to the book of homilies and the thirty-nine articles, which they reported to the house; as,

1. "That he maintained the church of Rome is, and ever was, a true church, contrary to the sixteenth homily of the church of England.

2. "That the said church had ever remained firm upon

* The ceremonial of the coronation is given at length by Fuller, b. 11. p. 121, &c. —Ed.

† "The manuscript coronation-book, which the king held in his hand, and which is still in being (says Dr. Grey), proves that the words were not spoken by Laud, but by the archbishop."—Ed.

the same foundation of sacraments and doctrine instituted by God.

3. "That speaking of the doctrines of faith, hope, and charity, he affirmed that none of these are controverted between the Papists and Protestants; but that the controverted points are of a lesser and inferior nature, of which a man may be ignorant without any danger of his soul.

4. "That he maintained the use of images, for instruction of the ignorant, and exciting devotion.

5. "That in his treatise of the "Invocation of saints," he affirmed that some saints have a peculiar patronage, custody, protection, and power (as angels have), over certain persons and countries.

6. "That in his "Appeal" he maintained that men justified may fall away from grace, and may recover again, but not certainly nor necessarily.

7. "That the said R. Montague has endeavoured to raise factions among the king's subjects, by casting the odious and scandalous name of Puritans upon those who conform to the doctrine and ceremonies of the church. That he scoffed at preaching, at lectures, and all shows of religion; and, that the design of his book was apparently to reconcile the church of England with the see of Rome."*

In what manner the commons designed to prosecute this impeachment is uncertain, for Montague was not brought to his defence, the king having intimated again to the house, that their proceedings against him without his leave, was displeasing to him; that as to their holding him to bail, he thought his servants might have the same protection as an ordinary burgess, and therefore he would take the cause into his own hands; and soon after dissolved the parliament.†

Though the Arminian controversy was thus wrested out of the hands of the parliament, it was warmly debated without doors; Montague was attacked in print by Dr. Carleton, bishop of Chichester; Dr. Sutcliffe, dean of Exeter; Dr.

* Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 213—215.

† Dr. Grey adds here, that "yet the king thought fit to call his book in." The doctor says this on the authority of Rushworth; whose farther account of the proceeding should be laid before the reader. "Ere this proclamation was published, (says he), the books were for the most part vented and out of danger of seizure, and the suppressing of all writing and preaching in answer the remedy was (it seems by some) the thing mainly intended, for the several answers were all suppressed, and divers of the printers questioned by the high-commission." Rushworth, vol. 2. p. 647.—Ed

Featly, Dr. Goad, Mr. Ward, Burton, Yates, Wotton, Prynne, and Fran. Rouse, esq. &c. Conferences were appointed to debate the point, of the possibility of the elect's falling from grace.* One was at York-house, February 11, 1625—6, before the duke of Buckingham, earl of Warwick, and other lords; Dr. Buckeridge bishop of Rochester, and Dr. White dean of Carlisle, being on one side; and Dr. Moreton bishop of Coventry, and Dr. Preston, on the other. The success of the dispute is variously related; but the earl of Pembroke said, that none went from thence Arminians, save those who came thither with the same opinions. Soon after, February 17, there was a second conference in the same place, Dr. White and Mr. Montague on one side, and Dr. Moreton and Preston on the other;† Dr. Preston carried it clear at first, by dividing his adversaries, who quickly perceiving their error, united their forces, says my author, in a joint opposition to him; but upon the whole, these conferences served rather to increase the differences than abate them. The king therefore issued out a proclamation, containing very express commands, not to preach or dispute upon the controverted points of Arminianism. It was dated January 24, 1626, and sets forth, "that the king will admit of no innovation in the doctrine, discipline, or government, of the church, and therefore charges all his subjects, and especially the clergy, not to publish, or maintain in preaching or writing, any new inventions or opinions, contrary to the said doctrine and discipline established by law, assuring them that his majesty will proceed against all offenders against this order, with all that severity their contempt shall deserve, that by the exemplary punishment of a few, others may be warned against falling under the just indignation of their sovereign."‡

One would have thought this proclamation to be in favour of Calvinism, but the execution of it being in the hands of Laud, and the bishops of his party, the edge was turned against the Puritans, and it became, says Rushworth,§ the stopping of their mouths, and gave an uncontrolled liberty to the tongues and pens of the Arminian party. Others were of opinion that Laud and Neile pro-

* Prynne's Cant. Doom, p. 158, 159; Fuller, b. 9. p. 14.
† Fuller, b. 11. p. 125. ‡ Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 116 Bib Regia.
§ Rushworth, p. 117. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 250, folio ed.

cured this injunction, in order to have an opportunity to oppress the Calvinists who should venture to break it, while the disobedience of the contrary party should be winked at. The Puritans thought they might still write in defence of the received doctrine of the thirty-nine articles; but the press being in the hands of their adversaries, some of their books were suppressed, some were castrated, and others that got abroad were called in,* and the authors and publishers questioned in the star-chamber and high-commission, for engaging in a controversy prohibited by the government. By these methods effectual care was taken, that the Puritan and Calvinian writers should do their adversaries no harm; bishop Laud with two or three of his chaplains, undertaking to judge of truth and error, civility and good manners, for all the wise and great men of the nation, in doing of which they were so shamefully partial, that learning and industry were discouraged, men of gravity and great experience not being able to persuade themselves to submit their labours to be mangled and torn in pieces by a few younger divines, who were both judges and parties in the affair. At length the booksellers being almost ruined, preferred a petition to the next parliament† [1628], complaining, that the writings of their best authors were stifled in the press, while the books of their adversaries [Papists and Arminians] were published and spread over the whole kingdom. Thus Cheney's "Collectiones theologicæ," an Arminian and Popish performance, was licensed, when the learned Dr. Twisse's answer to Arminius, though written in Latin, was stopped in the press.‡ Mr. Montague's book, entitled, "God's love to mankind," was licensed and published, when Dr. Twisse's reply to the same book was suppressed. Many affidavits of this kind were made against Laud at his trial, by the most famous Calvinistical writers, as will be seen hereafter.

The case was just the same with regard to books against Popery; the queen and the Roman Catholics must not be insulted, and therefore all offensive passages, such as calling the pope antichrist, the church of Rome no true church, and every thing tending to expose images in churches, crucifixes, penance, auricular confession, and Popish absolution, must be expunged. Sir Edward Deering compares the licensers of the press to the managers of the *index ex-*

* Prynne, p. 150, 159. † Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 607. ‡ Prynne, p. 166, 167, &c.

purgatorius among the Papists, "who clip the tongues of such witnesses whose evidences they do not like; in like manner (says he) our licensers suppress the truth, while Popish pamphlets fly abroad *cum privilegio;* nay, they are so bold as to deface the most learned labours of our ancient and best divines. But herein the Roman *index* is better than ours, that they approve of their own established doctrines; but our innovators alter our settled doctrines, and superinduce points repugnant and contrary. This I do affirm, and can take upon myself to prove."

Terrible were the triumphs of arbitrary power over the liberty and property of the subject, in the intervals between this and the succeeding parliament; gentlemen of birth and character, who refused to lend what money the council was pleased to assess them, were taken out of their houses and imprisoned at a great distance from their habitations;* among these were, sir Thomas Wentworth, sir Walter Earle, sir John Strangeways, sir Thomas Grantham, sir Harbottle Grimstone, John Hampden, esq. nd others; some were confined in the Fleet, the Marshalsea, the Gatehouse, and other prisons about London, as, sir John Elliot, Mr. Selden, &c.

Upon the whole, there were imprisoned by order of council, nineteen knights, thirteen esquires, and four gentlemen, in the county jails; three knights, one esquire, and four wealthy citizens, in the Fleet, besides great numbers in other places. Those of the lower sort who refused to lend were pressed for the army, or had soldiers quartered upon them, who by their insolent behaviour disturbed the peace of families, and committed frequent felonies, burglaries, rapines, murders, and other barbarous cruelties, insomuch that the highways were dangerous to travel, and the markets unfrequented. The king would have borrowed 100,000*l.* of the city of London, but they excused themselves. However, his majesty got a round sum of money from the Papists, by issuing a commission to the archbishop of York, to compound with them for all their forfeitures that had been due for recusancy, since the tenth of king James I. or that should be due hereafter. By this fatal policy (says the noble historian) men well-affected to the hierarchy, though enemies to arbitrary power, were

* Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 120. 452. 130. 495.

obliged to side with the Puritans to save the nation, and enable them to oppose the designs of the court.

To convince the people that it was their duty to submit to the loan, the clergy were employed to preach up the doctrines of passive obedience and nonresistance, and to prove that the absolute submission of subjects to the royal will and pleasure, was the doctrine of Holy Scripture;* among those was Dr. Sibthorp, a man of mean parts, but of sordid ambition, who in his sermon at the Lent assizes at Northampton, from Romans xiii. 7, told the people, "that if princes commanded any thing which subjects might not perform, because it is against the laws of God or of nature, or impossible, yet subjects are bound to undergo the punishment, without resisting, or railing, or reviling; and so to yield a passive obedience where they cannot yield an active one." Dr. Manwaring went farther in two sermons preached before the king at Oatlands, and published under the title of "Religion and allegiance." He says, "the king is not bound to observe the laws of the realm, concerning the subjects' rights and liberties, but that his royal will and pleasure, in imposing taxes without consent of parliament, doth oblige the subject's conscience on pain of damnation; and that those who refuse obedience, transgress the laws of God, insult the king's supreme authority, and are guilty of impiety, disloyalty, and rebellion. That the authority of both houses of parliament is not necessary for the raising aids and subsidies, as not suitable to the exigencies of the state." These were the doctrines of the court; "which (says the noble historian) were very unfit for the place, and very scandalous for the persons, who presumed often to determine things out of the verge of their own profession, and in *ordine ad spiritualia*, gave unto Cæsar that which did not belong to him."

Sibthorp dedicated his sermon to the king, and carried it to archbishop Abbot to be licensed, which the honest old prelate refused, for which he was suspended from all his archiepiscopal functions, and ordered to retire to Canterbury or Ford, a moorish unhealthy place, five miles beyond Canterbury. The sermon was then carried to the bishop of London, who licensed and recommended it as a sermon learnedly and discreetly preached, agreeable to the ancient

* Rushworth, p. 127, 140.

doctrine of the primitive church, both for faith and good manners, and to the established doctrine of the church of England.

Archbishop Abbot had been out of favour for some time, because he would not give up the laws and liberties of his country, nor treat the great duke of Buckingham with that servile submission that he expected.* Heylin says, the king was displeased with him for being too favourable to the Puritans, and too remiss in his government; and that for this reason he seized his jurisdiction, and put it into hands more disposed to act with severity. Fuller says,† that a commission was granted to five bishops, whereof Laud was one, to suspend him for casual homicide that he had committed seven years before, and of which he had been cleared by commissioners appointed to examine into the fact in the reign of king James; besides, his grace had a royal dispensation to shelter him from the canons, and had ever since exercised his jurisdiction without interruption, even to the consecrating of Laud himself to a bishoprick. But the commission mentions no cause of his suspension, and only takes notice, that the archbishop cannot at present, in his own person, attend the services which are otherwise proper for his cognizance and jurisdiction. But why could he not attend them? Because his majesty had commanded him to retire, for refusing to license Sibthorp's sermon. The blame of this severity fell upon Laud, as if, not having patience to wait for the reverend old prelate's death, he was desirous to step into the archiepiscopal chair while he was alive; for no sooner was Abbot suspended, than his jurisdiction was put into the hands of five bishops by commission, of whom Laud was the chief.

There was another prelate that gave the court some uneasiness, viz. Dr. Williams bishop of Lincoln, late lord-keeper of the great seal, who being in disgrace retired to his diocess, and became very popular among his clergy.‡ He declared against the loan, and fell in with the Puritans and country party, insomuch that sir John Lamb and Dr. Sibthorp informed the council, that they were grieved to see the bishop of Lincoln give place to unconformable ministers, when he turned his back upon those who were con-

* Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 61. 433. Collyer, p. 744.
† Church History, b. 11. p. 127. ‡ Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 424, 425.

formable; that the Puritans ruled all with him; and that divers of them in Leicestershire being convened before the commissaries, his lordship would not admit proceedings to be had against them. That they [the commissaries for the high-commission] had informed the bishop then at Bugden, of several of the factious Puritans in his diocess who would not come up to the table to receive the communion kneeling; of their keeping unlawful fasts and meetings; that one fast held from eight in the morning till nine at night; and that collections for money were made without authority, upon pretence for the Palatinate: that therefore they had desired leave from the bishop to proceed against them *ex officio;* but the bishop replied, that he would not meddle against the Puritans, that for his part he expected not another bishoprick; they might complain of them if they would to the council-table, for he was under a cloud already. He had the duke of Buckingham for his enemy, and therefore would not draw the Puritans upon him, for he was sure they would carry all things at last. Besides, he said, the king, in the first year of his reign, had given answer to a petition of the lower house at Oxford in favour of the Puritans.

It appeared by the information of others, that Lamb and Sibthorp pressed the bishop again to proceed against the Puritans in Leicestershire; that the bishop then asked them, what sort of people they were, and of what condition? To which sir John Lamb replied, in the presence of Dr. Sibthorp, "that they seemed to the world to be such as would not swear, whore, nor be drunk, but yet they would lie, cozen, and deceive; that they would frequently hear two sermons a day, and repeat the same again too, and afterward pray, and that sometimes they would fast all day long." Then the bishop asked whether the places where those Puritans were, did lend money freely upon the collection for the loan. To which sir John Lamb and Dr. Sibthorp replied that they did. Then said the bishop, No man of discretion can say, that that place is a place of Puritans: for my part (said the bishop) I am not satisfied to give way to proceedings against them; at which Sibthorp was much discontented, and said he was troubled to see that the church was no better regarded. This information being transmitted to the council, was sealed up for the pre-

sent, but was afterward, with some other matters, produced against his lordship in the star-chamber, as will be seen hereafter.

Though the king was at war with Spain, and with the house of Austria, and (if I may be allowed to say it) with his own subjects; though he had no money in his exchequer, and was at the greatest loss how to raise any; yet he suffered himself to be prevailed with to enter into a new war with France, under the colour of maintaining the Protestant religion in that country, without so much as thinking of ways and means to support it. But when one considers the character of this king and his ministry, it is hard to believe that this could be the real motive of the war; for his majesty and the whole court had a mortal aversion to the French Hugonots.* Buckingham had no religion at all; Weston and Conway were Catholics; Laud and Neile thought there was no salvation for Protestants out of the church of England; how then can it be supposed that they should make war in defence of a religion for which they had the utmost contempt? Lord Clarendon says, the war was owing to Buckingham's disappointment in his amours at the French court;† but it is more likely he advised it to keep up the misunderstandings between the king and his parliaments, by continuing the necessity of raising money by extraordinary methods, upon which his credit and reputation depended. War being declared, the queen's domestics were sent home, and a fleet was fitted out, which made a fruitless descent upon the isle of Rhee, under the conduct of the duke of Buckingham, with the loss of five thousand men. This raised a world of complaints and murmurs against the duke, and obliged the weak and unhappy king to try the experiment of another parliament, which was appointed to meet March 17, 1627—8.

As soon as this resolution was taken in council, orders were dispatched to all parts of the kingdom, to release the gentlemen imprisoned for the loan, to the number of seventy-eight, most of whom were chosen members for the ensuing parliament. In the meantime, his majesty went on with raising money by excise; and instead of palliating and softening the mistakes of his government, put on an air of high sovereignty, and told his parliament, that if they

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 260, folio edit. † Ibid. vol. 1. p. 36, 39.

did not provide for the necessities of the state, he should use those other means that God had put into his hands, to save that which the follies of other men would hazard. "Take not this (says his majesty) as a threatening, for I scorn to threaten my inferiors,* but as an admonition from him, who by nature and duty has most care of your preservation and prosperity."†

But the parliament, not being awed by this language, began with grievances; and though they voted five subsidies, they refused to carry the bill through the house, till they had obtained the royal assent to their petition of right, which asserted, among others, the following claims contained in magna charta:

1. That no freeman shall be detained in prison by the king and privy council, without the cause of commitment be expressed, for which by law he ought to be detained.

2. That a *habeas corpus* ought not to be denied, where the law allows it.

3. That no tax, loan, or benevolence, shall be imposed without act of parliament.

4. That no man shall be forejudged of life or limb, or be exiled or destroyed, but by the judgment of his peers, according to the laws of the land, or by act of parliament.

The king gave the royal assent to this bill in the most ample manner, which I mention, that the reader may remember what regard his majesty paid to it in the twelve succeeding years of his reign.

In the meantime, the house of lords went upon Manwaring's sermons already mentioned, and passed the following sentence upon the author; "that he be imprisoned during pleasure, and be fined one thousand pounds; that he make his submission at the bar of the house, and be suspended from his ministry for three years; that he be disabled for ever from preaching at court, be incapable of any ecclesiastical or secular preferment, and that his sermons be burnt in London, and both universities.‡ Pursuant to this

* "Any but equals." Rushworth. Dr. Gray, who gives this correction, quotes other passages from the king's speech with a view to soften Mr. Neal's representation of it; but with little propriety; for though he expresses "a hope of being laid under such obligations as would tie him by way of thankfulness to meet them often," the whole wears the same air of sovereignty as the passage above. It is more in the tone of an angry monarch to his offending subjects, than of a constitutional king of England to his parliament. Ed.

† Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 410. ‡ Ibid. vol. 1. p. 601, 612, 613.

sentence, Manwaring appeared upon his knees at the bar of the house, June 23 [1628], and made an ample acknowledgment and submission, craving pardon of God, the king, the parliament, and the whole commonwealth, in words drawn up by a committee: but the houses were no sooner risen, than his fine was remitted, and himself preferred first to the living of Stamford-Rivers, with a dispensation to hold St. Giles's in the fields, then to the deanery of Worcester, and after some time to the bishoprick of St. David's.

Within a month after this [August 22], Montague was promoted to the bishoprick of Chichester, while he lay under the censure of parliament. At his consecration at Bow-church, Mr. Jones, a stationer of London, stood up, and excepted against his qualification for a bishoprick, because the parliament had voted him incapable of any preferment in the church; but his exceptions were overruled, not being delivered in by a proctor; though Jones averred that he could not prevail with any one to appear for him, though he offered them their fees: so the consecration proceeded.

Sibthorp, the other incendiary, was made prebendary of Peterborough, and rector of Burton-Latimer in Wiltshire; though the Oxford historian* confesseth he had nothing to recommend him but forwardness and servile flattery.

While the money-bill was going through the house of lords, the commons were busy in drawing up a remonstrance of the grievances of the nation, with a petition for redress: but as soon as the king had obtained his money, he came to the house June 26, and prorogued the parliament, first to the 20th of October, and then to the 26th of January. The commons being disappointed of presenting their remonstrance, dispersed it through the nation; but the king called it in, and after some time published an answer drawn up by bishop Laud, as was proved against him at his trial.

The remonstrance was dated June 11, and besides the civil grievances of billeting soldiers, &c. complains with regard to religion.

1. Of the great increase of Popery, by the laws not being put in execution: by conferring honours and places of command upon Papists; by issuing out commissions to com-

* Athenæ Oxon. vol. 1. p. 180.

pound for their recusancy, and by permitting mass to be said openly at Denmark-house and other places.

The answer denies any noted increase of Popery, or that there is any cause to fear it. As for compositions, they are for the increase of his majesty's profit, and for returning that into his purse, which the connivance of inferior officers might perhaps divert another way.

2. The remonstrance complains of the discountenancing orthodox and painful ministers, though conformable and peaceable in their behaviour, insomuch that they are hardly permitted to lecture where there is no constant preaching. —That their books are prohibited, when those of their adversaries are licensed and published.—That the bishops Neile and Laud are justly suspected of Arminianism and Popish errors; and that this being the way to church-preferment, many scholars bend the course of their studies to maintain them.

The answer denies the distressing or discountenancing good preachers, if they be, as they are called, good; but affirms, that it was necessary to prohibit their books, because some whom the remonstrance calls orthodox, had assumed an insufferable licence in printing.—That great wrong was done to the two eminent prelates mentioned, without any proof: for should they or any others attempt innovation of religion, says his majesty, we should quickly take order with them, without staying for the remonstrance; and as for church-preferments, we will always bestow them as the reward of merit; but as the preferments are ours, we will be judge, and not be taught by a remonstrance.

3. The remonstrance complains of the growth of Arminianism, as a cunning way to bring in Popery.

The answer says, this is a great wrong to ourself and government; for our people must not be taught by a parliamentary remonstrance, or any other way, that we are so ignorant of truth, or so careless of the profession of it, that any opinion or faction should thrust itself so fast into our dominions without our knowledge. This is a mere dream, and would make our loyal people believe we are asleep.

But the following letter, written at this time by a Jesuit in England, to the rector of the college at Brussels, sufficiently supports the parliament's charge, and shews how Arminianism and Popery, which have no natural connexion,

came to be united at this time against the Protestant religion, and the liberties of England.

"Let not the damp of astonishment seize upon your ardent and zealous soul (says the Jesuit), in apprehending the unexpected calling of a parliament; we [the Papists] have not opposed, but rather furthered it.—

"You must know the council is engaged to assist the king by way of prerogative, in case the parliament fail. You shall see this parliament will resemble the pelican, which takes pleasure to dig out with her beak her own bowels.

"The elections have been in such confusion of apparent faction, as that which we were wont to procure with much art and industry, when the Spanish match was in treaty.—

"We have now many strings to our bow, and have strongly fortified our faction, and have added two bulwarks more; for when king James lived, he was very violent against Arminianism, and interrupted our strong designs in Holland.

"Now we have planted that sovereign drug Arminianism, which we hope will purge the Protestants from their heresy, and it flourishes and bears fruit in due season.

"The materials that build up our bulwark, are the projectors and beggars of all ranks and qualities; however, both these factions co-operate to destroy the parliament, and to introduce a new species and form of government, which is oligarchy.

"These serve as mediums and instruments to our end, which is the universal Catholic monarchy; our foundation must be mutation, and mutation will cause a relaxation.—

"We proceed now by counsel and mature deliberation, how and when to work upon the duke's [Buckingham's] jealousy and revenge; and in this we give the honour to those that merit it, which are the church Catholics.

"There is another matter of consequence which we must take much into our consideration and tender care, which is, to stave off Puritans, that they hang not in the duke's ears: they are an impudent subtile people, and it is to be feared lest they should negotiate a reconciliation between the duke and the parliament at Oxford and Westminster; but now we assure ourselves, that we have so handled the matter, that both the duke and parliament are irreconcilable.

"For the better prevention of the Puritans, the Arminians have already locked up the duke's ears, and we have those of our own religion that stand continually at the duke's chamber, to see who goes in and out. We cannot be too circumspect and careful in this regard. I cannot choose but laugh to see how some of our own coat have accoutred themselves; and it is admirable how in speech and gesture they act the Puritans. The Cambridge scholars, to their woful experience shall see, we can act the Puritans a little better than they have done the Jesuits. They have abused our sacred patron in jest, but we will make them smart for it in earnest.

"But to return to the main fabric, our foundation is Arminianism; the Arminians and projectors affect mutation; this we second and enforce by probable arguments. We shew how the king may free himself of his ward, and raise a vast revenue without being beholden to his subjects, which is by way of excise. Then our church Catholics shew the means how to settle the excise, which must be by a mercenary army of foreigners and Germans; their horse will eat up the country where they come, though they be well paid, much more if they be not paid. The army is to consist of twenty thousand foot, and two thousand horse; so that if the country rise upon settling the excise, as probably they will, the army will conquer them, and pay themselves out of the confiscation. Our design is to work the Protestants as well as the Catholics to welcome in a conqueror. We hope to dissolve trade, to hinder the building of shipping, and to take away the merchant-ships, that they may not easily light upon the West-India fleet," &c.

It appears from this letter, that Puritanism was the only bulwark of the constitution, and of the Protestant religion, against the inroads of Popery and arbitrary power.*

* Here Dr. Grey asks, "Whence does this appear? not from those words in the same letter, which shew that the Puritans were the tools which the Jesuits designed to make *use of*, in order to subvert the constitution in the church and state?" The reply to the doctor is, that the truth of Mr. Neal's remark appears from those paragraphs of the letter, in which are expressed *strong apprehensions*, that impediments and obstructions to *the* views and schemes it unfolds, would arise from the Puritans. Nay, the justness of the remark appears *from* the words which Dr. Grey produces as refuting it. For, if the Jesuits noted the Puritan, could it be with a sincere desire to advance *the influence of the Puritans*, and *promote* their wishes? could it be with any other design than to turn against them the confidence into which by this means they insinuated themselves, and to undermine the reformation by increasing divisions and fomenting prejudices against it? of this collection of papers, called "Foxes and

4. To go on with the parliament's remonstrance, which complains farther of the miserable condition of Ireland, where the Popish religion is openly professed, and their ecclesiastical discipline avowed, monasteries, nunneries, and other religious houses re-edified, and filled with men and women of several orders, even in the city of Dublin itself.

The answer says, that the Protestant religion is not in a worse condition than queen Elizabeth left it; and adds, that it is a disparagement to the king's government to report the building of religious houses in Dublin, and other places, when the king himself had no account of it.

But it seems the parliament knew more of the affairs of Ireland than bishop Laud; the agents for that kingdom had represented the Protestant religion in great danger, by the suspending all proceedings against them ever since the king came to the crown; by this means they were become so bold, that when lord Falkland summoned their chiefs to meet at Dublin, 1626, in order to a general contribution for defence of the kingdom against a foreign invasion, they declared roundly, that they would contribute nothing without a toleration, and liberty to build religious houses; upon which the assembly was dismissed. This awakened the Protestant bishops, who met together, and signed the following protestation, November 26, 1626.

"The religion of Papists is superstitious and idolatrous, and their church apostolical; to give them therefore a toleration is a grievous sin, because it makes ourselves accessory to all the abominations of Popery,* and to the perdition of those souls that perish thereby; and because granting a toleration in respect of any money to be given, or contribution to be made by them, is to set religion to sale, and with it the souls that Christ has redeemed with his blood; we

firebrands," furnishes evident proofs. Of this two curious letters given by Dr. Grey from the MSS. of sir Robert Cotton, furnish convincing proofs. Yet the doctor again asks, "Can Mr. Neal, after all, be so weak, as to imagine that the Jesuits would have put on the Puritan garb, in order to have ruined the constitution, and the Puritans been the only bulwark of the constitution?" Weak as it might be in Mr. Neal to imagine it, it is a fact; that they did assume the character of the Puritans in order to carry those purposes, to which the Puritans were inimical. Dr. Grey, probably, would not have thought this so weak a policy, as he represents it, had he recollected what is said of the false teachers in the primitive church; who "transformed themselves into the apostles of Christ." Had he recollected, that it is said of Satan, that "he transformed himself *into* an angel of light;" and this to overturn those interests of truth and virtue, of which the former knew that the latter were the bulwark.—Ed.

* "From so silly a sophism, so gravely delivered, I conclude (says bishop Warburton) Usher was not that great man he has been represented."—Ed.

therefore beseech the God of truth, to make those who are in authority, zealous for God's glory, and resolute against all Popery, superstition, and idolatry." Signed by archbishop Usher, and eleven of his brethren.

But notwithstanding this protestation, the Papists gained their point, and in the fourth year of the king's reign had a toleration granted them, in consideration of the sum of 120,000*l.* to be paid in three years.*

With regard to the building religious houses, it is wonderful that neither the king nor his prime minister should know any thing of it, when the lord-deputy Falkland had this very summer issued out a proclamation with this preamble: "Forasmuch as we cannot but take notice, that the late intermission of the legal proceedings against Popish pretended or titular archbishops, bishops, abbots, deans, vicars-general, and others of that sort, that derive their authority and orders from Rome, hath bred such an extraordinary insolence and presumption in them, as that they have dared of late, not only to assemble themselves in public places, but also have erected houses and buildings, called public oratories, colleges, mass-houses, and convents of friars, monks, and nuns, in the eye and open view of the state and elsewhere, and do frequently exercise jurisdiction against his majesty's subjects, by authority derived from Rome, and by colour of teaching schools in their pretended monasteries, to train up youth in their superstitious religion, contrary to the laws and ecclesiastical government of this kingdom: we therefore will and require them to forbear to exercise their jurisdiction within this kingdom, and to relinquish and break up their convents and religious houses, &c." Could such a proclamation be printed and dispersed over the kingdom of Ireland, without being known to the English court?

But farther, to shew that bishop Laud himself was not

* It is to be regretted that Mr. Neal did not refer to his authority for this assertion. Dr. Grey quotes against it Collyer, vol. 2. p. 759; who says, that the protestation of the bishops "prevailed with the government to waive the thoughts of a toleration, and pitch upon some other expedients." The doctor might have added from Fuller, that the motion was crushed by the bishops, and chiefly by bishop Downham's sermon in Dublin, on Luke i. 17. Church History, b. 11. p. 158. Though we cannot ascertain the authority on which Mr. Neal speaks, the reader will observe, that he is not contradicted by Collyer and Fuller; for they speak of the immediate effect of the opposition of the bishops to the toleration of the Irish Catholics, and he writes of a measure adopted in repugnance to it, two years afterward.—Ed.

long ignorant of the dangerous increase of Popery in Ireland, the bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh, Dr. Bodell, sent him the following account soon afterward; it was dated April 1, 1630. "The Popish clergy are more numerous than those of the church of England; they have their officials and vicars-general for ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and are so hardy as to excommunicate those who appear at the courts of the Protestant bishops. Almost every parish has a priest of the Romish communion; masses are sometimes said in churches, and excepting a few British planters, not amounting to the tenth part of the people, the rest are all declared recusants. In each diocess there are about seven or eight of the reformed clergy well qualified, but these not understanding the language of the natives cannot perform divine service, nor converse with their parishioners to advantage, and consequently are in no capacity to put a stop to superstition."*

Let the reader now judge, whether the answer to the remonstrance be not very evasive. Could this great statesman be ignorant of so many notorious facts? was the growth of Arminianism and arbitrary power, a dream? was any wrong done to himself, or his brother of Winchester, by saying they countenanced these principles? was not the increase

* "Here (says Dr. Grey) we have a long train of mistakes." There are, it is true, several. Dr. Bedell is called Dr. Bradle, and bishop elect of Kilmore, whereas he had the contiguous sees of Kilmore and Ardagh, and was the actual bishop of both, when *this letter was written*, April 1, 1630, having been consecrated 13th September 1629. *These mistakes are imputed to Mr. Neal*: but Dr. Grey should have possessed the candour to have informed his readers, that they belong to Mr. Collyer, from whom the whole paragraph is taken. *This* he could not but have observed, for he immediately refers himself to Collyer, to blame Mr. Neal for not mentioning a remark of that author, viz. that bishop Bedell's account related to his own two dioceses only. This the reader would of course understand to be the case, and even with this limitation, it is a proof of the increase of Popery in Ireland, *though it should not be* presumed to be a specimen of the state of things in other dioceses. The bishop's letter was written, as we have said, in April 1630, and Mr. Neal introduces it as sent about that time of which he was writing, i. e. about June 1628. This is charged against him as an anachronism, but it is a small mistake, and even a blunder. But in a matter of this nature, where the existing state of things must have been the result of causes that had been some time operating, and shows a settled complexion of men and manners, it may admit a question, whether the space of a year and nine months can be deemed an anachronism. The bishop's account certainly indicates what had been the growing state of things for many months.

Mr. Neal, by quoting Collyer in the above paragraph, has missed the most striking clause in bishop Bedell's letter. He concludes by saying, "His majesty is now with the greatest part of this country, as to their bodies and consciences, King, but at the pope's discretion." Though it is not to the design of these notes, the editor is tempted here to give a trait in the character of this prelate's lady; who, it is said, "was singular in many excellent qualities, particularly in a very extraordinary reverence she paid to her husband." Bishop Burnet's Life of Bedell, p. 47. 2.30.—Ed

of Popery both in England and Ireland notorious, by suspending the penal laws, ever since the king came to the crown, and granting the Papists a toleration for a sum of money? where then was the policy of lulling the nation asleep, while the enemy were increasing their numbers, and whetting their swords for a general massacre of the Protestants, which they accomplished in Ireland about twelve years afterward?

The bishop observes in his diary, that this parliament laboured his ruin, because they charged him with unsoundness of opinion; but his lordship had such an influence over the king as rendered all their attempts fruitless; for the see of London becoming vacant this summer, Laud was translated to it July 15;* and the duke of Buckingham being stabbed at Portsmouth by Felton, August 23, following, this ambitious prelate became prime minister in all affairs both of church and state.

One of the bishop's first enterprises, after his translation to London, was to stifle the predestinarian controversy, for which purpose he procured the thirty-nine articles to be reprinted, with the following declaration at the head of them.†

By the King.

"Being by God's ordinance, and our just title, defender of the faith, &c. within these dominions, we hold it agreeable to our kingly office, for the preservation of unity and peace, not to suffer any unnecessary disputations which may nourish faction in the church or commonwealth: we, therefore, with the advice of our bishops, declare, that the articles of the church of England which the clergy generally have subscribed, do contain the true doctrine of the church of England, agreeable to God's word, which we do therefore ratify and confirm, requiring all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said articles.—We take comfort in this, that all clergymen within our realm have always most willingly subscribed the articles, which is an argument that they all agree, in the true usual literal meaning of them;

* Rib. Reg. sect. 3 no. 4; or Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 188.

† Mr. Neal does not give the declaration at full length, but has omitted some clauses and even two paragraphs, but in my opinion, without affecting the sense and tenor of it: though, Dr. Grey says, "he has by this altered and curtailed the sense of it, and then charged it with blunders, which are of his own making."—Ed

and that in those curious points, in which the present differences lie, men of all sorts take the articles to be for them which is an argument again, that none of them intend any desertion of the articles established: wherefore we will, that all curious search into these things be laid aside, and these disputes be shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the articles according to them; and that no man hereafter preach or print to draw the article aside any way, but shall submit to it, in the plain and full manner thereof, and shall not put his own sense or comment to the meaning of the article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense: that if any public reader in the universities, or any other person, shall affix any new sense to any article, or shall publicly read, or hold disputation on either side; or if any divine in the universities shall preach or print any thing either way, they shall be liable to censure in the ecclesiastical commission, and we will see there shall be due execution upon them."*

Surely there never was such a confused unintelligible declaration printed before; but the Calvinist divines understood the king's intention, and complained in a petition of "the restraints they were laid under by his majesty's forbidding them to preach the saving doctrines of God's free grace in election and predestination to eternal life, according to the seventeenth article of the church. That this had brought them under a very uncomfortable dilemma, either of falling under the divine displeasure, if they did not execute their commission, in declaring the whole counsel of God, or of being censured for opposition to his majesty's authority, in case they preached the received doctrines of the church, and attacked the Pelagian and Arminian heresies boldly published from the pulpit and press, though censured by king James as arrogant and atheistical; and those who avow them to be agreeable to the church of England are

* This declaration, Dr. Harris observes, has been produced and canvassed in the famous Bangorian and Trinitarian controversies, which engaged the attention of the public for a great number of years. Life of Charles I. p. 181 - 190. Dr. Blackburne has at large discussed the validity of it and is disposed to consider James I. as the best publisher of it. He shews that it has been corrupted by the insertion of the word *nem*; as, "we will not endure any version or departing, in the least degree, from the doctrine and discipline of the church of England now established;" a language he justly observes, inconsistent with the principle of our present constitution. Cont. Fund. p. 131 - 133. 3d edit. Fr.

called gross liars. Therefore, they humbly entreat, that his majesty would be pleased to take the forementioned evils and grievances into his princely consideration, and, as a wise physician, apply such speedy remedies as may both cure the present distemper, and preserve the church and state from those plagues with which their neighbours had not been a little distressed." But this address was stopped in its progress, and never reached the king's ears.

In pursuance of his majesty's declaration, all books relating to the Arminian controversy were called in by proclamation and suppressed, and among others Montague's and Manwaring's, which was only a feint to cover a more deadly blow to be reached at the Puritans; for at the same time Montague and Manwaring received the royal pardon, and were preferred to some of the best livings in the kingdom (as has been observed), while the answer to their books, by Dr. Featly, Dr. Goad, Mr. Burton, Ward, Yates, and Rouse, were not only suppressed, but the publishers questioned in the star-chamber.

The king put on the same thin disguise with regard to Papists; a proclamation was issued out against priests and Jesuits, and particularly against the bishop of Chalcedon; orders were also sent to the lord-mayor of London, to make search after them, and commit them to prison, but at the same time his majesty appointed commissioners to compound with them for their recusancy; so that instead of being suppressed, they became a branch of the revenue. and sir Richard Weston, a notorious Papist, was created earl of Portland, and made lord high-treasurer of England.

When the parliament met according to prorogation, January 20, they began again with grievances of religion: Oliver Cromwell, esq. being of the committee, reported to the house the countenance that was given by Dr. Neile bishop of Winchester, to divines who preached Arminian and Popish doctrine; he mentioned the favours that had been bestowed upon Montague and Manwaring, who had been censured the last sessions of parliament; and added, "If this be the way to church-preferment, what may we expect?' Upon debating the king's late declaration, the house voted, "that the main end of that declaration was to suppress the Puritan party, and to give liberty to the contrary side." Several warm and angry speeches were like

wise made against the new ceremonies that began now to be introduced into the church, as images of saints and angels, crucifixes, altars, lighted candles, &c.

Mr. Rouse stood up and said, "—I desire it may be considered, what new paintings have been laid upon the old face of the whore of Babylon, to make her shew more lovely. I desire it may be considered, how the see of Rome doth eat into our religion, and fret into the very banks and walls of it, the laws and statutes of this realm. I desire we may consider the increase of Arminianism, an error that makes the grace of God lackey after the will of man.—I desire we may look into the belly and bowels of this Trojan horse, to see if there be not men in it ready to open the gates to Romish tyranny, for an Arminian is the spawn of a Papist; and if the warmth of favour come upon him, you shall see him turn into one of those frogs that rose out of the bottomless pit; these men having kindled a fire in our neighbour-country, are now endeavouring to set this kingdom in a flame."*

Mr. Pym said, "that by the articles set forth 1562, by the catechism set forth in king Edward VI.'s days, by the writings of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr; by the constant professions sealed with the blood of many martyrs, as, Cranmer, Ridley, and others; by the thirty-six articles of queen Elizabeth, and by the articles agreed upon at Lambeth as the doctrine of the church of England, which king James sent to Dort, and to Ireland, it appears evidently what is the established religion of the realm. Let us therefore shew wherein these late opinions differ from those truths; and what men have been since preferred who have professed the contrary heresies; what pardons they have had for false doctrine; what prohibiting of books and writings against their doctrine, and permitting of such books as have been for them. Let us inquire after the abettors, and after the pardons granted to them that preach the contrary truth before his majesty. It belongs to parliaments to establish true religion, and to punish false. We must know what parliaments have done formerly in religion. Our parliaments have confirmed general councils. In the time of king Henry VIII. the earl of Essex was condemned [by parliament] for countenancing books of heresy. The

* Rushworth, p. 657—668.

convocation is but a provincial synod of Canterbury, and cannot bind the whole kingdom. As for York it is distant, and cannot bind us or the laws; and as for the high-commission, it is derived from parliament——"*

Sir John Elliot said, "——If there be any difference in opinion concerning the interpretation of the thirty-nine articles, it is said, the bishops and clergy in convocation have power to dispute it, and to order which way they please. A slight thing, that the power of religion should be left to those men! I honour their profession; there are among our bishops such as are fit to be made examples for all ages, who shine in virtue, and are firm for religion; but the contrary faction I like not. I remember a character I have seen in a diary of king Edward VI. where he says of the bishops, that "some for age, some for ignorance, some for luxury, and some for Popery, were unfit for discipline and government." We see there are some among our bishops that are not orthodox, nor sound in religion as they should be, witness the two bishops complained of the last meeting of this parliament; should we be in their power, I fear our religion would be overthrown. Some of these are masters of ceremonies, and labour to introduce new ceremonies into the church.——Let us go to the ground of our religion, and lay down a rule on which all others may rest, and then inquire after offenders."†

Mr. secretary Cook said, "that the fathers of the church were asleep; but, a little to awaken their zeal, it is fit (says he) that they take notice of that hierarchy that is already established, in competition with their lordships, for they [the Papists] have a bishop consecrated by the pope; this bishop has his subaltern officers of all kinds, as vicars-general, archdeacons, rural deans, apparitors, &c. neither are these nominal or titular officers only, but they all execute their jurisdictions, and make their ordinary visitations throughout the kingdom, keep courts, and determine ecclesiastical causes; and, which is an argument of more consequence, they keep ordinary intelligence by their agents in Rome, and hold correspondence with the nuncios and cardinals both at Brussels and France. Neither are the seculars alone grown to this height, but the regulars are more active and dangerous.——Even at this time they intend to

* Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 659. † Ibid. vol. 1. p. 660, 661.

hold a concurrent assembly with this parliament.—" After some other speeches of this kind, the house of commons entered into the following vow.

" We the commons, in parliament assembled, do claim, protest, and avow for truth, the sense of the articles of religion which were established by parliament in the thirteenth year of our late queen Elizabeth, which by the public act of the church of England, and by the general and current exposition of the writers of our church, have been delivered unto us. And we reject the sense of the Jesuits and Arminians, and all others that differ from us."*

Bishop Laud, in his answer to this protestation, has several remarks. " Is there by this act (says his lordship) any interpretation of the articles or not? If none, to what end is the act? If a sense or interpretation be declared, what authority have laymen to make it? for interpretation of an article belongs to them only that have power to make it." To which it might be answered, that the commons made no new interpretation of the articles, but avowed for truth the current sense of expositors before that time, in opposition to the modern interpretation of Jesuits and Arminians. But what authority have laymen to make it? Answer. The same that they had in the 13th of Elizabeth to establish them, as the doctrine of the church of England; unless we will say with Mr. Collyer, that neither the sense of the articles, nor the articles themselves, were established in that parliament or in any other.† If so, they are no part of the legal constitution, and men may subscribe the words without putting any sense upon them at all: an admirable way to prevent diversity of opinions in matters of faith! But his lordship adds, " that it is against the king's declaration, which says, we must take the general meaning of them, and not draw them aside any way, but take them in the literal and grammatical sense."‡ Has the king then a power, without convocation or parliament, to interpret and determine the sense of the articles for the whole body of the clergy? By the general meaning of the articles, the decla-

* " This protestation (Dr. Blackburne remarks) is equivalent at least to any other resolution of the house. It is found amongst the most authentic records of parliament. And whatever force or operation it had the moment it was published, the same it has to this hour; being never revoked or repealed by any succeeding parliament, nor containing any one particular, which is not in perfect agreement with every part of our present constitution, civil and religious." Confessional, p. 112.

† Eccles. Hist. p. 717. ‡ Prynne Cant. Doom. p. 164.

ration seems to understand no one determined sense at all. Strange! that so learned and wise a body of clergy and laity, in convocation and parliament, should establish a number of articles with this title, "for the avoiding of diversity of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion," without any one determined sense! The bishop goes on, and excepts against the current sense of expositors, "because they may, and perhaps do, go against the literal sense." Will his lordship then abide by the literal and grammatical sense! No, but "if an article bear more senses than one, a man may choose what sense his judgment directs him to, provided it be a sense, according to the analogy of faith, till the church determine a [particular] sense; but it is the wisdom of the church to require consent to articles in general as much as may be, and not require assent to particulars." His lordship had better have spoken out, and said, that it would be the wisdom of the church to require no subscriptions at all. To what straits are men driven to comply with the laws, when their sentiments differ from the literal and grammatical sense of the articles of the church! Mr. Collyer says, they have no established sense; king Charles, in his declaration, that they are to be understood in a general sense, but not to be drawn aside to a particular determined sense; bishop Laud thinks, that if the words will bear more senses than one, a man may choose what sense his judgment directs him to, provided it be a sense, according to the analogy of faith, and all this for avoiding diversity of opinions! But I am afraid this reasoning is too wonderful for the reader.

While the parliament were expressing their zeal against Arminianism and Popery, a new controversy arose, which provoked his majesty to dissolve them, and to resolve to govern without parliaments for the future; for though the king had so lately signed the petition of right in full parliament, he went on with levying money by his royal prerogative. A bill was depending in the house to grant his majesty the duties of tonnage and poundage; but before it was passed, the customhouse-officers seized the goods of three eminent merchants, viz. Mr. Rolls, Mr. Chambers, and Mr. Vassal, for nonpayment. Mr. Chambers was fined 2,000*l.* besides the loss of his goods, and suffered six years' imprisonment: Mr. Rolls's warehouses were locked

up, and himself taken out of the house of commons and imprisoned. This occasioned some warm speeches against the customhouse-officers and farmers of the revenues; but the king took all the blame on himself, and sent the house word, that what the officers had done, was by his special direction and command, and that it was not so much their act as his own. This was a new way of covering the unwarrantable proceedings of corrupt ministers, and was said to be the advice of the bishops Laud and Neile; a contrivance that laid the foundation of his majesty's ruin. It is a maxim in law, that the king can do no wrong, and that all misadministrations are chargeable upon his ministers; yet now, in order to screen his servants, his majesty will make himself answerable for their conduct. So that if the parliament will defend their rights and properties, they must charge the king personally, who in his own opinion was above law, and accountable for his actions to none but God. It was moved in the house, that notwithstanding the king's answer, the officers of the customs should be proceeded against, by separating their interests from the king's: but when the speaker, sir John Finch, was desired to put the question, he refused, saying, the king had commanded the contrary.* Upon which the house immediately adjourned to January 25, and were then adjourned by the king's order to March 2, when meeting again, and requiring the speaker to put the former question, he again refused, and said he had the king's order to adjourn them to March 16, but they detained him in the chair, not without some tumult and confusion, till they made the following protestation:—

1. "Whosoever shall, by favour or countenance, seem to extend or introduce Popery or Arminianism, shall be reputed a capital enemy of the kingdom.

2. "Whosoever shall advise the levying the subsidies of tonnage and poundage, not being granted by parliament, shall be reputed a capital enemy.

3. "If any merchant shall voluntarily pay those duties, he shall be reputed a betrayer of the liberties of England, and an enemy of the same."†

The next day warrants were directed to Denzil Hollis,

* Whitelocke's Memorial, p. 12. Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 669.
† Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 670.

sir John Elliot, William Coriton, Benjamin Valentine, John Selden, esqrs. and four more of the principal members of the house, to appear before the council on the morrow: four of them appeared accordingly, viz. Mr. Hollis, Elliot, Coriton, and Valentine; who refusing to answer out of parliament for what was said in the house, were committed close prisoners to the Tower. The studies of the rest were ordered to be sealed up, and a proclamation issued for apprehending them; though the parliament not being dissolved, they were actually members of the house. On the 10th of March, the king came to the house of lords, and without sending for the commons, or passing one single act, dissolved the parliament, with a very angry speech against the leading members of the lower house, whom he called vipers, that cast a mist of undutifulness over most of their eyes: "and as those vipers (says his majesty) must look for their reward of punishment; so you, my lords, must justly expect from me that favour that a good king oweth to his loving and faithful nobility."*

The undutifulness of the commons was only their keeping the speaker in the chair, after he had signified that the king had adjourned them, which his majesty had no power of doing, and no king before king James I. pretended to adjourn parliaments, and when he claimed that power, it was complained of as a breach of privilege. It is one thing to prorogue or dissolve a parliament, and another to adjourn it, the latter being the act of the house itself, and the consequence of vesting such a power in the crown might be very fatal; for if the king may adjourn the house in the midst of their debates, or forbid the speaker to put a question when required, it is easy to foresee the whole business of parliament must be under his direction.† The members above mentioned were sentenced to be imprisoned during the king's pleasure; and were accordingly kept under close confinement many years, where sir John Elliot died a martyr to the liberties of his country.‡ Mr. Hollis was

* Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 672. † Rapin, vol. 2. p. 279, folio edit.

‡ "An affecting portrait of this gentleman is now in the possession of lord Elliot. He is drawn pale, languishing, and emaciated:—but disdaining to make the abject submission required of him by the tyrant, he expired under the excessive rigours of his confinement, leaving the portrait as a legacy and memento to his pos-

fined a thousand marks, sir John Elliot 2,000*l.* Valentine 500*l.* and Long two thousand marks.

Great were the murmurings of the people upon this occasion; libels were dispersed against the prime minister Laud; one of which says, "Laud, look to thyself, be assured thy life is sought. As thou art the fountain of wickedness, repent of thy monstrous sins before thou be taken out of this world; and assure thyself, neither God nor the world can endure such a vile counsellor or whisperer to live."* But to justify these proceedings to the world, his majesty published "a declaration of the causes of dissolving the last parliament."

The declaration vindicates the king's taking the duties of tonnage and poundage, from the examples of some of his predecessors, and as agreeable to his kingly honour. It justifies the silencing the predestinarian controversy, and lays the blame of not executing the laws against Papists, upon subordinate officers and ministers in the country: "We profess (says his majesty) that as it is our duty, so it shall be our care, to command and direct well; but it is the part of others to perform the ministerial office; and when we have done our office, we shall account ourself, and all charitable men will account us, innocent, both to God and men; and those that are negligent, we will esteem culpable, both to God and us." The declaration concludes with a profession that "the king will maintain the true religion of the church of England, without conniving at Popery or schism: that he will maintain the rights and liberties of his subjects, provided they do not misuse their liberty, by turning it to licentiousness, wantonly and frowardly resisting our lawful and necessary authority; for we do expect our subjects should yield as much submission to our royal prerogative, and as ready obedience to our authority and commandments, as has been performed to the greatest of

terity, and to mankind; who, in the contemplation of such enormities, have reason to rejoice

'When vengeance in the lucid air
Lifts her red arm expos'd and bare.'"

Belsham's Memoirs of the House of Brunswick Lunenburgh, vol. 1. p. 185, note Ko.

* Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 672.

our predecessors. We will not have our ministers terrified by harsh proceedings against them; for as we expect our ministers should obey us, they shall assure themselves we will protect them."*

This declaration not quieting the people, was followed by a proclamation, which put an end to all prospects of recovering the constitution for the future. The proclamation declares his majesty's royal pleasure, "that spreaders of false reports shall be severely punished; that such as cheerfully go on with their trades, shall have all good encouragement: that he will not overcharge his subjects with any new burdens, but will satisfy himself with the duties received by his royal father, which he neither can nor will dispense with. And whereas, for several ill ends, the calling of another parliament is divulged, his majesty declares, that the late abuse having for the present driven his majesty unwillingly out of that course, he shall account it presumption for any to prescribe any time to his majesty for parliaments, the calling, continuing, and dissolving, of which, is always in the king's own power."†——Here was an end of the old English constitution, for twelve years. England was now an absolute monarchy; the king's proclamations and orders of council were the laws of the land; the ministers of state sported themselves in the most wanton acts of power; and the religion, laws, and liberties, of this country lay prostrate and overwhelmed by an inundation of Popery and oppression.

This year died the reverend Dr. John Preston, descended of the family of the Prestons in Lancashire. He was born at Heyford in Northamptonshire, in the parish of Bugbrook, 1587, and was admitted of King's college, Cambridge, 1604, from whence he was afterward removed to Queen's college, and admitted fellow in the year 1609.‡ He was an ambitious and aspiring youth, till having received some religious impressions from Mr. Cotton, in a sermon preached by him at St. Mary's church, he became remarkably serious, and bent all his studies to the service of Christ in the ministry. When the king came to Cambridge, Mr. Preston was appointed to dispute before him: the question was, Whether brutes had reason, or could make syllogisms? Mr. Preston

* Rushworth, vol. 2. Appen. p. 3—10. † Ibid. vol. 2. p. 1.
‡ Clarke's Life of Dr. Preston; annexed to his General Martyrology, p. 75.

maintained the affirmative; and instanced in a hound, who coming to a place where three ways meet, smells one way and the other; but not finding the scent runs down the third with full cry, concluding that the hare not being gone either of the two first ways, must necessarily be gone the third. The argument had a wonderful effect on the audience, and would have opened a door for Mr. Preston's preferment, had not his inclinations to Puritanism been a bar in the way. He therefore resolved upon an academical life, and took upon him the care of pupils, for which he was qualified beyond most in the university. Many gentlemen's sons were committed to his care, who trained them up in the sentiments of the first reformers; for he affected the very style and language of Calvin. When it came to his turn to be catechist, he went through a whole body of divinity with such general acceptance, that the outward chapel was usually crowded with strangers before the fellows came in, which created him envy. Complaint was made to the vice-chancellor of this unusual way of catechising, and that it was not safe to suffer Dr. Preston to be thus adored, unless they had a mind to set up Puritanism, and pull down the hierarchy; it was therefore agreed in the convocation-house, that no stranger, neither townsman nor scholar, should upon any pretence come to those lectures, which were only designed for the members of the college.

There was little preaching in the university at this time, except at St. Mary's, the lectures at Trinity and St. Andrew's being prohibited; Mr. Preston therefore, at the request of the townsmen and scholars of other colleges attempted to set up an evening sermon at St. Botolph's belonging to Queen's college; but when Dr. Newcomb, commissary to the bishop of Ely, heard of it, he came to the church and forbade it, commanding that evening prayers only should be read; there was a vast crowd, and earnest entreaty that Mr. Preston might preach, at least for that time, but the commissary was inexorable, and to prevent farther importunities, went home with his family; after he was gone, Mr. Preston was prevailed with to preach; and because much time had been spent in debates, they adventured for once to admit the service, that the scholars might be present at their college-prayers. Next day the commissary went to Newmarket, and complained both to the bi-

shop and king; he represented the danger of the hierarchy, and the progress of nonconformity among the scholars, and assured them that Mr. Preston was in such high esteem, that he would carry all before him if he was not thoroughly dealt with. Being called before his superiors, he gave a plain narrative of the fact; and added, that he had no design to affront the bishop or his commissary. The bishop said, the king was informed that he was an enemy to forms of prayer, which Mr. Preston denying, he was ordered to declare his judgment upon that head, in a sermon at St. Botolph's church, and so was dismissed.

Some time after, king James being at Newmarket, Mr. Preston was appointed to preach before him, which he performed with great applause, having a fluent speech, a commanding voice, and a strong memory, to deliver what he had prepared without the assistance of notes. The king spake familiarly to him; and though his majesty expressed a dislike to some of his Puritan notions, he commended his opposing the Arminians. And the duke of Buckingham not knowing what friends he might want among the populace, persuaded the king to admit him one of the prince's chaplains in ordinary, and to wait two months in the year, which he did. Soon after this he was chosen preacher of Lincoln's inn, and upon the resignation of Dr. Chadderton, master of Emanuel-college, in the year 1622, at which time he took his degree of doctor of divinity. The doctor was a fine gentleman, a complete courtier, and in high esteem with the duke of Buckingham, who thought by his means to ingratiate himself with the Puritans,* whose power was growing very formidable in parliament. The duke offered him the bishoprick of Gloucester, but the doctor refused, and chose rather the lectureship of Trinity-church, which he kept till his death. By his interest in the duke and the prince, he did considerable service for many silenced ministers; he was in waiting when king James died, and came up with the young king and duke in a close coach to London. But some time after the duke having changed measures, and finding that he could neither gain over the Puritans to his arbitrary designs, nor separate the doctor from their interests, he resolved to shake hands with his chaplain. The

* "But Preston, who was as great a politician as the duke (says Mr. Granger), was not to be overreached." — Ed.

doctor foreseeing the storm, was content to retire quietly to his college, where it is apprehended he would have felt some farther effects of the duke's displeasure, if God in his providence had not cut him out work of a different nature, which engaged all his thoughts to the time of his death.

Dr. Preston lived a single life, being never married; nor had he any cure of souls. He had a strong constitution, which he wore out in his study and in the pulpit. His distemper was a consumption in the lungs, for which, by the advice of physicians, he changed the air several times; but the failure of his appetite, with other symptoms of a general decay, prevailed with him at length to leave off all medicine, and resign himself to the will of God. And being desirous of dying in his native country, and among his old friends, he retired into Northamptonshire, where he departed this life in a most pious and devout manner, in the forty-first year of his age; and was buried in Fawsley-church, old Mr. Dod, minister of the place, preaching his funeral-sermon to a numerous auditory, July 20, 1628. Mr. Fuller* says, "He was an excellent preacher, a subtle disputant, a great politician; so that his foes must confess, that (if not having too little of the dove) he had enough of the serpent. Some will not stick to say, he had parts sufficient to manage the broad-seal, which was offered him, but the conditions did not please. He might have been the duke's right hand, but his grace finding that he could not bring him nor his party off to his side, he would use him no longer;" which shews him to be an honest man. His practical works and sermons were printed by his own order after his decease.

CHAP. IV.

FROM THE DISSOLUTION OF THE THIRD PARLIAMENT OF KING CHARLES I. TO THE DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP ABBOT.

The ancient and legal government of England, by king, lords, and commons, being now suspended by the royal will and pleasure, his majesty resolved to supply the necessities

* Book II. p. 131.

of the state, by such other methods as his council should advise, who gave a loose to their actions, being no longer afraid of a parliamentary inquiry, and above the reach of ordinary justice. Instead of the authority of king and parliament, all public affairs were directed by proclamations of the king and council, which had the force of so many laws, and were bound upon the subject under the severest penalties. They levied the duties of tonnage and poundage, and laid what other imposts they thought proper upon merchandise, which they let out to farm to private persons; the number of monopolies was incredible; there was no branch of the subject's property that the ministry could dispose of, but was bought and sold. They raised above 1,000,000*l.* a year by taxes on soap, salt, candles, wine, cards, pins, leather, coals, &c. even to the sole gathering of rags. Grants were given out for weighing hay and straw within three miles of London; for gauging red-herring-barrels, and butter-casks; for marking iron, and sealing lace;* with a great many others; which being purchased of the crown, must be paid for by the subject. His majesty claimed a right in cases of necessity (of which necessity himself was the sole judge) to raise money by ship-writs, or royal mandates, directed to the sheriffs of the several counties, to levy on the subject the several sums of money therein demanded, for the maintenance and support of the royal navy. The like was demanded for the royal army, by the name of coat and conduct money, when they were to march; and when they were in quarters, the men were billeted upon private houses. Many were put to death by martial law, who ought to have been tried by the laws of the land; and others by the same martial law were exempted from the punishment, which by law they deserved. Large sums of money were raised by commissions under the great seal, to compound for depopulations, for nuisances in building between high and low water mark, for pretended encroachments on the forests, &c. beside the exorbitant fines of the star-chamber and high-commission court; and the extraordinary projects of loans, benevolences, and free gifts. Such was the calamity of the times, that no man could call any thing his own longer than the king pleased; or might speak or write

* Stevens's Historical Account of all Taxes, p. 180, 181. 2d. edit.

against these proceedings, without the utmost hazard of his liberty and estate.

The church was governed by the like arbitrary and illegal methods; Dr. Laud, bishop of London, being prime minister, pursued his wild scheme of uniting the two churches of England and Rome,* without the least regard to the rights of conscience, or the laws of the land, and very seldom to the canons of the church, bearing down all who opposed him with unrelenting severity and rigour. To make way for this union, the churches were not only to be repaired, but ornamented with pictures, paintings, images, altar-pieces, &c. the forms of public worship were to be decorated with a number of pompous rites and ceremonies, in imitation of the church of Rome; and the Puritans, who were the professed enemies of every thing that looked like Popery, were to be suppressed or driven out of the land. To accomplish the latter, his lordship presented the king with certain considerations for settling the church, which were soon after published, with some little variation, under the title of "Instructions to the two archbishops, concerning certain orders to be observed, and put in execution by the several bishops."

Here his majesty commands them to see, that his declaration for silencing the predestinarian controversy be strictly observed; and that special care be taken of the lectures and afternoon sermons, in their several dioceses, concerning which he is pleased to give the following instructions.†

1. "That in all parishes the afternoon sermons be turned

* Dr. Grey is much displeased with Mr. Neal for this representation of Laud's views; but without bringing any direct evidence to refute it, he appeals to the answer of Fisher, and the testimonies of sir Edward Deering and Limborch, to shew, that the archbishop was not a Papist. This may be admitted, and the proofs of it are also adduced by Dr. Harris [Life of Charles I. p. 207], yet it will not be so easy to acquit Laud of a partiality for the church, though not the court, of Rome, according to the distinction May makes in his "Parliamentary history." It will not be so easy to clear him of the charge of symbolizing with the church of Rome in its two leading features, superstition and intolerance. Under his primacy the church of England, it is plain, assumed a very Popish appearance. "Not only the pomps of ceremonies were daily increased, and innovations of great scandal brought into the church; but, in point of doctrine, many fair approaches made towards Rome. Even Heylin says, the doctrines are altered in many things; as, for example, the pope not antichrist, pictures, free-will, &c.; the thirty-nine articles seeming patient, if not ambitious also, of some Catholic sense."—May's Parliamentary History, p. 22, 23 and Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 252.—Ed.

† A liberal mind will reprobate these instructions, as evading argument, preventing discussion and inquiry, breathing the spirit of intolerance and persecution, and indicating timidity.—Ed.

into catechising by question and answer, where there is not some great cause to break this ancient and profitable order.

2. "That every lecturer read divine service before lectures in surplice and hood.

3. "That where there are lectures in market-towns, they be read by grave and orthodox divines; and that they preach in gowns, and not in cloaks, as too many do use.

4. "That no lecturer be admitted, that is not ready and willing to take upon him a living with cure of souls.

5. "That the bishops take order, that the sermons of the lecturers be observed.

6. "That none under noblemen, and men qualified by law, keep a private chaplain.

7. "That care be taken, that the prayers and catechisings be frequented, as well as sermons." Of all which his majesty requires an account once a year.

By virtue of these instructions, the bishop of London summoned before him all ministers and lecturers in and about the city, and in a solemn speech insisted on their obedience. He also sent letters to his archdeacons, requiring them to send him lists of the several lecturers within their archdeaconries, as well in places exempt as not exempt, with the places where they preached, and their quality or degree; as also the names of such gentlemen, who being not qualified, kept chaplains in their own houses. His lordship required them farther, to leave a copy of the king's instructions concerning lecturers with the parson of every parish, and to see that they were duly observed.

These lecturers were chiefly Puritans, who not being satisfied with a full conformity, so as to take upon them a cure of souls, only preached in the afternoons, being chosen and maintained by the people. They were strict Calvinists, warm and affectionate preachers, and distinguished themselves by a religious observance of the Lord's day, by a bold opposition to Popery and the new ceremonies, and by an uncommon severity of life. Their manner of preaching gave the bishop a distaste to sermons, who was already of opinion that they did more harm than good, insomuch that on a fast-day for the plague then in London, prayers were ordered to be read in all churches, but not a sermon to be preached, lest the people should wander from their own

parishes. The lecturers had very popular talents, and drew great numbers of people after them. Bishop Laud would often say, "they were the most dangerous enemies of the state, because by their prayers and sermons they awakened the people's disaffection, and therefore must be suppressed."

Good old archbishop Abbot was of another spirit, but the reins were taken out of his hands. He had a good opinion of the lecturers, as men who had the Protestant religion at heart, and would fortify their hearers against the return of Popery.* When Mr. Palmer, lecturer of St. Alphage in Canterbury, was commanded to desist from preaching by the archdeacon, because he drew great numbers of factious people after him, and did not wear the surplice, the archbishop authorized him to continue: the like he did by Mr. Udnay of Ashford, for which he was complained of, as not enforcing the king's instructions, whereby the commissioners, as they say, were made a scorn to the factious, and the archdeacon's jurisdiction inhibited. But in the diocess of London bishop Laud proceeded with the utmost severity. Many lecturers were put down, and such as preached against Arminianism or the new ceremonies, were suspended and silenced; among whom were, the reverend Mr. John Rogers of Dedham, Mr. Daniel Rogers of Wethersfield, Mr. Hooker of Chelmsford, Mr. White of Knightsbridge, Mr. Archer, Mr. William Martin, Mr. Edwards, Mr Jones, Mr. Dod, Mr. Hildersham, Mr. Ward, Mr. Saunders, Mr. James Gardiner, Mr. Foxley, and many others.

The reverend Mr. Bernard, lecturer of St. Sepulchre's, London, having used this expression in his prayer before sermon, "Lord open the eyes of the queen's majesty, that she may see Jesus Christ, whom she has pierced with her infidelity, superstition, and idolatry,"† was summoned before the high-commission January 28, and upon his humble submission was dismissed; but some time after, in his sermon at St. Mary's in Cambridge, speaking offensive words against Arminianism and the new ceremonies, bishop Laud sent for a copy of his sermon, and having cited him before the high-commission, required him to make an open recantation of what he had said, which his conscience not suffering him to do, he was suspended from his ministry, ex-

* Prynne's Introd. p. 94. 361 371.
† Rushworth, vol 2. p. 12 140. Prynne, p. 365 367.

communicated, fined 1,000*l.* condemned in costs of suit, and committed to New-prison, where he lay several months, being cruelly used, and almost starved for want of necessaries, of which he complained to the bishop in sundry letters, but could get no relief unless he would recant. Mr. Bernard offered to confess his sorrow and penitence for any oversights, or unbecoming expressions in his sermons, which would not be accepted; so that in conclusion he was utterly ruined.

Mr. Charles Chauncey, minister of Ware, having said in a sermon, "that the preaching of the gospel would be suppressed, and that there was much Atheism, Popery, Arminianism, and heresy, crept into the church," was questioned for it in the high-commission, and not dismissed till he had made an open recantation, which we shall meet with hereafter.

Mr. Peter Smart, one of the prebendaries of Durham and minister of that city, was imprisoned by the high-commission of York this summer, for a sermon preached from these words, "I hate all those that love superstitious vanities, but thy law do I love;" in which he took occasion to speak against images and pictures, and the late pompous innovations. He was confined four months before the commissioners exhibited any articles against him, and five more before any proctor was allowed him. From York he was carried up to Lambeth, and from thence back again to York, and at length was deprived of his prebend, degraded, excommunicated, fined 500*l.* and committed close prisoner, where he continued eleven years, till he was set at liberty by the long parliament in 1640. He was a person of a grave and reverend aspect,* but died soon after his release: the severity of a long imprisonment having contributed to the impairing his constitution.†

* Fuller's Church History, b. 3. p. 173.

† "Here the historian (remarks bishop Warburton) was much at a loss for his confessor's good qualities, while he is forced to take up with his grave and reverend aspect." It might have screened this passage from his lordship's sneer and sarcasm, that those are the words of Fuller, whose history furnished the whole paragraph, and whose description of Mr. Smart goes into no other particulars. His lordship certainly did not wish Mr. Neal to have drawn a character from his own invention; not to urge that the countenance is the index of the mind. It appears, as Dr. Grey observes, that the proceedings against Smart commenced in the high-commission court in Durham. See Wood's Athenæ Oxon. vol. 3. p. 11. The doctor, and Nelson in his Collections, vol. 1. p. 518, 519, produce some paragraphs from Smart's sermon to shew the style and spirit of it. There was printed a virulent tract at Durham, 1636, entitled, "An illustration of Mr. Neal's History of the Puritans, in the article of

The king's instructions and the violent measures of the prime minister, brought a great deal of business into the spiritual courts; one or other of the Puritan ministers was every week suspended or deprived, and their families driven to distress; nor was there any prospect of relief, the clouds gathering every day thicker over their heads, and threatening a violent storm. This put them upon projecting a farther settlement in New England, where they might be delivered from the hands of their oppressors, and enjoy the free liberty of their consciences; which gave birth to a second grand colony in North America, commonly known by the name of the Massachusets-bay. Several persons of quality and substance about the city of London engaging in the design, obtained a charter dated March 4, 1628—9, wherein the gentlemen and merchants therein named, and all who should thereafter join them, were constituted a body corporate and politic, by the name of the governor and company of the Massachusets-bay in New England. They were empowered to elect their own governor, deputy-governor, and magistrates, and to make such laws as they should think fit for the good of the plantation, not repugnant to the laws of England. Free liberty of conscience was likewise granted to all who should settle in those parts, to worship God in their own way.* The new planters being all Puritans, made their application to the reverend Mr. Higginson, a silenced minister in Leicestershire, and to Mr. Skelton, another silenced minister of Lincolnshire, to be their chaplains, desiring them to engage as many of their friends as were willing to embark with them. The little fleet that went upon this expedition, consisted of six sail of transports, from four to twenty guns, with about three hundred and fifty passengers, men, women, and children. They carried with them one hundred and fifteen head of cattle, as horses,

Peter Smart, A. M." It is a detail of the proceedings against Smart, and of subsequent proceedings in parliament against Dr. Cosins upon the complaint of Smart; whom the author aims to represent in a very unfavourable point of view; but without necessity, as the very persecution of him shows, that he must have been very offensive to those who were admirers of the superstitions and ceremonies against which he inveighed. He was afterward not only set at liberty, but by the order of the lords, in 1642, was restored to his prebend in Durham, and was presented to the vicarage of Aycliff in the same diocese. Nelson's Collections, vol. 2. p. 406. The Puritans, by whom he was esteemed a protomartyr, it is said, raised 400*l.* a year for him by a subscription. Granger's History of England, vol. 2. p. 177. Ed.

* This is a mistake: the charter did not once mention liberty of conscience or toleration. See Gordon's History of the American War, vol. 1. p. 19. Ed.

mares, cows, &c. forty-one goats, six pieces of cannon for a fort, with muskets, pikes, drums, colours, and a large quantity of ammunition and provision. The fleet sailed May 11, 1629, and arrived the 24th of June following, at a place called by the natives, Neumkeak but by the new planters Salem, which in the Hebrew language signifies peace.

Religion being the chief motive of their retreating into these parts, that was settled in the first place. August the 6th being appointed for the solemnity of forming themselves into a religious society, the day was spent in fasting and prayer; and thirty persons who desired to be of the communion, severally in the presence of the whole congregation, declared their consent to a confession of faith which Mr. Higginson had drawn up, and signed the following covenant with their hands.

"We covenant with our Lord, and one with another. We bind ourselves, in the presence of God, to walk together in all his ways, according as he is pleased to reveal himself to us in his blessed word of truth, and do profess to walk as follows, through the power and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

"We avouch the Lord to be our God, and ourselves to be his people, in the truth and simplicity of our spirits.

"We give ourselves to the Lord Jesus Christ, and to the word of his grace, for the teaching, ruling, and sanctifying us, in matters of worship and conversation, resolving to reject all canons and constitutions of men in worship.

"We promise to walk with our brethren with all watchfulness and tenderness, avoiding jealousies, suspicions, backbitings, censurings, provokings, secret risings of spirit against them; but in all offences to follow the rule of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to bear and forbear, give and forgive, as he hath taught us.

"In public or private we will willingly do nothing to the offence of the church, but will be willing to take advice for ourselves and ours, as occasion shall be presented.

"We will not in the congregation be forward, either to shew our own gifts and parts in speaking, or scrupling, or in discovering the weaknesses or failings of our brethren; but attend an ordinary call thereunto, knowing how much the Lord may be dishonoured, and his gospel, and the pro-

* Neal's History of New England, p. 120.

fession of it, slighted by our distempers, and weaknesses in public.

"We bind ourselves to study the advancement of the gospel in all truth and peace, both in regard of those that are within or without, no way slighting our sister-churches, but using their counsel as need shall be; not laying a stumbling-block before any, no, not the Indians, whose good we desire to promote, and so to converse as we may avoid the very appearance of evil.

"We do hereby promise to carry ourselves in all lawful obedience to those that are over us in church or commonwealth, knowing how well-pleasing it will be to the Lord, that they should have encouragement in their places by our not grieving their spirits by our irregularities.

"We resolve to approve ourselves to the Lord in our particular callings, shunning idleness, as the bane of any state; nor will we deal hardly or oppressingly with any, wherein we are the Lord's stewards.

"Promising also, to the best of our ability, to teach our children and servants the knowledge of God, and of his will, that they may serve him also. And all this not by any strength of our own, but by the Lord Jesus Christ, whose blood we desire may sprinkle this our covenant made in his name."

After this they chose Mr. Skelton their pastor, Mr. Higginson their teacher, and Mr. Houghton their ruling elder, who were separated to their several offices by the imposition of the hands of some of the brethren appointed by the church to that service.* The first winter proved a fatal one to the infant colony, carrying off above one hundred of their company, and among the rest Mr. Houghton their elder, and Mr. Higginson their teacher, the latter of whom not being capable of undergoing the fatigues of a new settlement, fell into a hectic, and died in the forty-third year of his age. Mr. Higginson had been educated in Emanuel-college, Cambridge, proceeding M. A. being afterward parson of one of the five churches in Leicester, where he continued for some years, till he was deprived for nonconformity; but such were his talents for the pulpit, that after his suspension, the town obtained liberty from bishop Williams to choose him for their lecturer, and maintained him by their voluntary

* Mather's Hist. New England, b. 3. p. 71. 76.

contributions, till Laud being at the head of the church-affairs, he was articled against in the high-commission, and expected every hour a sentence of perpetual imprisonment: this induced him to accept of an invitation to remove to New England, which cost him his life. Mr. Skelton, the other minister, was a Lincolnshire divine, who being silenced for nonconformity, accepted of a like invitation, and died of the hardships of the country, August 2, 1634. From this small beginning is the Massachuset province grown to the figure it now makes in the American world

Next summer the governor went over with a fresh recruit of two hundred ministers, gentlemen, and others, who were forced out of their native country by the heat of the Laudean persecution. Upon their embarkation they left behind them a paper, which was soon after published, entitled, "The humble request of his majesty's loyal subjects, the governor and company lately gone for New England, to the rest of their brethren in and of the church of England, for the obtaining of their prayers, and removal of suspicions and misconstructions of their intentions." Wherein they entreat the reverend fathers and brethren of the church of England, to recommend them to the mercies of God in their constant prayers, as a new church now springing out of their bowels: "for you are not ignorant (say they) that the Spirit of God stirred up the apostle Paul to make a continual mention of the church of Philippi, which was a colony from Rome. Let the same Spirit, we beseech you, put you in mind, that are the Lord's remembrancers, to pray for us without ceasing; and what goodness you shall extend to us, in this or any other Christian kindness, we, your brethren in Christ, shall labour to repay in what duty we are or shall be able to perform; promising, so far as God shall enable us, to give him no rest on your behalf, wishing our heads and hearts may be fountains of tears for your everlasting welfare, when we shall be in our poor cottages in the wilderness, overshadowed with the spirit of supplication, through the manifold necessities and tribulations which may not altogether unexpectedly, nor, we hope, unprofitably befal us."

When it appeared that the planters could subsist in their new settlement, great numbers of their friends with their families flocked after them every summer. In the succeed-

ing twelve years of archbishop Laud's administration, there went over about four thousand planters,* who laid the foundation of several little towns and villages up and down the country, carrying over with them, in materials, money, and cattle, &c. not less than to the value of 192,000*l.* besides the merchandise intended for traffic with the Indians. Upon the whole, it has been computed, that the four settlements of New England, viz. Plymouth, the Massachusets-bay, Connecticut, and Newhaven, all which were accomplished before the beginning of the civil wars, drained England of four or five hundred thousand pounds in money (a very great sum in those days), and if the persecution of the Puritans had continued twelve years longer, it is thought that a fourth part of the riches of the kingdom would have passed out of it through this channel.

The chief leaders of the people into these parts were the Puritan ministers, who being hunted from one diocess to another, at last chose this wilderness for their retreat, which has proved (through the overruling providence of God) a great accession to the strength and commerce of these kingdoms. I have before me a list of seventy-seven divines, who became pastors of sundry little churches and congregations in that country before the year 1640, all of whom were in orders in the church of England. The reader will meet with an account of some of them in the course of this history; and I must say, though they were not all of the first rank for deep and extensive learning, yet they had a better share of it than most of the neighbouring clergy; and, which is of more consequence, they were men of strict sobriety and virtue; plain, serious, affectionate preachers, exactly conformable in sentiment to the doctrinal articles of the church of England, and took a great deal of pains to promote Christian knowledge, and a reformation of manners in their several parishes.

To return to England. Though Mr. Davenant, the learned bishop of Salisbury, had declared for the doctrine of universal redemption at the synod of Dort, he was this year brought into trouble for touching upon the point of predestination,† in his Lent sermon before the king, on Romans vi. 23, "The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus

* Mather's Hist. N. E. b. 1. p. 17, 23. † Fuller, b. 11. p. 138.

Christ our Lord." This was construed as a contempt of the king's injunctions, for which his lordship was two days after summoned before the privy council, where he presented himself upon his knees, and so had continued, for any favour he received from any of his own function then present; but the temporal lords bade him rise and stand to his defence. The accusation was managed by Dr. Harsnet, archbishop of York; Laud walking by all the while in silence, without speaking a word. Harsnet put him in mind of his obligations to king James; of the piety of his present majesty's instructions; and then aggravated his contempt of them with great vehemence and acrimony. Bishop Davenant replied with mildness, that he was sorry that an established doctrine of the church should be so distasted; that he had preached nothing but what was expressly contained in the seventeenth article, and was ready to justify the truth of it. It was replied, that the doctrine was not gainsaid, but the king had commanded these questions should not be debated, and therefore his majesty took it more offensively that any should do it in his own hearing. The bishop replied, that he never understood that his majesty had forbidden the handling any doctrine comprised in the articles of the church, but only the raising new questions, or putting a new sense upon them, which he never should do; that in the king's declaration all the thirty-nine articles are confirmed, among which the seventeenth of predestination is one; that all ministers are obliged to subscribe to the truth of this article, and to continue in the true profession of that as well as the rest; the bishop desired it might be shewn wherein he had transgressed his majesty's commands, when he had kept himself within the bounds of the article, and had moved no new or curious questions. To which it was replied, that it was the king's pleasure, that for the peace of the church these high questions might be forborne. The bishop then said, he was sorry he understood not his majesty's intention, and that for the time to come he would conform to his commands.* Upon this he was dismissed without farther trouble, and was after some time admitted to kiss the king's hand, who did not fail to remind him that the doctrine of predestination was too big for the people's understanding, and therefore

* Prynne, p. 175. 176.

he was resolved not to give leave for discussing that controversy in the pulpit. Hereupon the bishop retired, and was never afterward in favour at court.

Soon after Mr. Madye, lecturer of Christ-church, London, was cited before the high-commission, and [March 10, 1630] was, by act of court, prohibited to preach any more within the diocess of London, because he had disobeyed the king's declaration, by preaching on predestination. Dr. Cornelius Burges, Mr. White, the famous Dr. Prideaux, Mr. Hobbes of Trinity-college, and Mr. Cook of Brazen-nose, with others, suffered on the same account.

But Dr. Alexander Leighton, a Scots divine, and father of the worthy and celebrated prelate of that name, so highly commended by bishop Burnet in the "History of his life and times," met with severe usage in the star-chamber, for venturing to write against the hierarchy of the church.* This divine had published, during the last session of parliament, an "Appeal to the parliament; or, Zion's plea against prelacy,"† wherein he speaks not only with freedom, but with very great rudeness and indecency against bishops; calling them "men of blood," and saying, "that we do not read of a greater persecution and higher indignities done towards God's people in any nation than in this, since the death of queen Elizabeth." He calls the prelacy of the church "antichristian." He declaims vehemently against the canons and ceremonies; and adds, that "the church has

* Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 55—57.

† Dr. Harris, who had read by far the greatest part of this piece, says, that "it was written with spirit, and more sense and learning than the writers of that stamp usually showed in their productions;" and adds, "I cannot for my life see any thing in it deserving so heavy a censure." Life of Charles I. p. 225. His calling the queen "a daughter of Heth," as Mr. Pierce observes, meant no more than that she was a Papist. Bishop Tillotson afterward used a not much better expression concerning foreign Popish princes, without giving any *umbrage*, in styling them "the people of these abominations." Such language had much countenance from the taste and spirit of the age. Whitelocke, as well as Heylin, represents Dr. Leighton as charged with exciting the parliament to kill all the bishops, and smite them under the fifth rib; and other writers have repeated the accusation: a circumstance not authed by Mr. Neal. It appears to be ungrounded, for Mr. Pierce could not find it in the books, but only a call on the parliament utterly to root out the hierarchy. Nor did it form any one of the articles of information against Dr. Leighton in the star-chamber. Pierce's Vindication, p. 177; and Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 44. It greatly aggravated the injustice and cruelty of the sentence passed on him; that his book was printed for the use of the parliament only, and not in England, but in Holland. The heads were previously sanctioned by the approbation of five hundred persons under their hands, who most some were members of parliament. And when the parliament was dissolved, he returned without bringing any copies of it into the land, but made it his special care to suppress them. A Letter from General Ludlow to Dr. Hollingworth, printed at Amsterdam, 1692, p. 23.—Ed.

her laws from the Scripture, and that no king may make laws for the house of God. He styles the queen a daughter of Heth, and concludes with saying, what a pity it is that so ingenious and tractable a king should be so monstrously abused by the bishops, to the undoing of himself and his subjects. Now though the warmth of these expressions can no ways be justified, yet let the reader consider whether they bear any proportion to the sentence of the court. The cause was tried June 4, 1630. The defendant, in his answer, owned the writing of the book, denying any ill intention; his design being only to lay these things before the next parliament for their consideration. Nevertheless, the court adjudged unanimously, that for this offence "the doctor should be committed to the prison of the Fleet for life, and pay a fine of 10,000*l.*; that the high-commission should degrade him from his ministry; and that then he should be brought to the pillory at Westminster, while the court was sitting, and be whipped; after whipping, be set upon the pillory a convenient time, and have one of his ears cut off, one side of his nose slit, and be branded in the face with a double S. S. for a sower of sedition: that then he should be carried back to prison, and after a few days be pilloried a second time in Cheapside, and be there likewise whipped, and have the other side of his nose slit, and his other ear cut off, and then be shut up in close prison for the remainder of his life." Bishop Laud pulled off his cap while this merciless sentence was pronouncing, and gave God thanks for it!

Between passing the sentence and execution, the doctor made his escape out of prison, but was retaken in Bedfordshire, and brought back to the Fleet. On Friday, November 6, part of the sentence was executed upon him, says bishop Laud in his diary, after this manner: "He was severely whipped before he was put in the pillory. 2. Being set in the pillory, he had one of his ears cut off. 3. One side of his nose slit. 4. Branded on the cheek with a red-hot iron with the letters S. S. On that day sevennight, his sores upon his back, ear, nose, and face, being not yet cured, he was whipped again at the pillory in Cheapside, and had the remainder of his sentence executed upon him, by cutting off the other ear, slitting the other side of his nose, and

branding the other cheek."* He was then carried back to prison, where he continued in close confinement for ten years, till he was released by the long parliament.† The doctor was between forty and fifty years of age, of a low stature, a fair complexion, and well known for his learning and other abilities: but his long and close confinement had so impaired his health, that when he was released he could hardly walk, see, or hear. The sufferings of this learned man moved the people's compassion; and, I believe, the records of the inquisition can hardly furnish an example of equal severity.

To make the distance between the church and the Puritans yet wider, and the terms of conformity more difficult, bishop Laud introduced sundry pompous innovations in imitation of Popery, that had no foundation in the laws of the realm, or the canons of the church. These were enforced both upon clergy and laity, with all the terrors of the high-commission, to the ruin of many families, and the raising very great disturbances in all parts of the kingdom.

St. Katherine Creed church in the city of London, having been lately repaired, was suspended from all divine service till it was again consecrated; the formality of which being very extraordinary, may give us an idea of the superstition of this prelate. On Sunday, January 16, 1630, bishop Laud came thither about nine in the morning, attended with several of the high-commission, and some civilians.‡ At his approach to the west door of the church, which was shut and guarded by halberdiers, some who were appointed for that purpose, cried with a loud voice, "Open, open, ye everlasting doors, that the King of glory may come in;" and presently the doors being opened, the bishop with some doctors and principal men entered. As soon as they were come within the place, his lordship fell down upon his knees, and with eyes lifted up, and his arms spread abroad, said, "This place is holy; the ground is holy: in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I pronounce it holy." Then walking up the middle aisle towards the chancel, he took up some of the dust, and threw it into the air several times. When he approached near the rail of the communion-table, he bowed towards it five or six times, and returning, went

* Rushworth's Collections, vol. I. p. 57, 58. † Pierce, p. 179—181.
‡ Rushworth, vol. I. p. 77.

round the church with his attendants in procession, saying first the hundredth, and then the nineteenth psalm, as prescribed in the Roman pontificale. He then read several collects, in one of which he prays God to accept of that beautiful building, and concludes thus: "We consecrate this church, and separate it unto thee as holy ground, not to be profaned any more to common use." In another he prays, "that all that should hereafter be buried within the circuit of this holy and sacred place, may rest in their sepulchres in peace, till Christ's coming to judgment, and may then rise to eternal life and happiness."* After this, the bishop, sitting under a cloth of state in the aisle of the chancel, near the communion-table, took a written book in his hand, and pronounced curses upon those who should thereafter profane that holy place by musters of soldiers, or keeping profane law-courts, or carrying burdens through it, and at the end of every curse he bowed to the east, and said, "Let all the people say, Amen." When the curses were ended, which were about twenty, he pronounced a like number of blessings upon all who had any hand in framing and building of that sacred and beautiful edifice, and on those who had given or should hereafter give, any chalices, plate, ornaments, or other utensils; and at the end of every blessing he bowed to the east, and said, "Let all the people say, Amen." After this followed the sermon, and then the sacrament, which the bishop consecrated, and administered after the following manner:

As he approached the altar, he made five or six low bows, and coming up to the side of it, where the bread and wine were covered, he bowed seven times; then, after reading many prayers, he came near the bread, and gently lifting up the corner of the napkin, beheld it, and immediately letting fall the napkin, retreated hastily a step or two, and made three low obeisances. His lordship then advanced, and having uncovered the bread, bowed three times as before; then laid his hand on the cup, which was full of wine, with a cover upon it, which having let go, he stepped back, and bowed three times towards it; then came near again, and lifting up the cover of the cup, looked into it, and seeing the wine, he let fall the cover again, retired back, and bowed as before: after which the elements were consecrated,

* Prynne's Complete History p. 114

and the bishop, having first received, gave it to some principal men in their surplices, hoods, and tippets; towards the conclusion, many prayers being said, the solemnity of the consecration ended.

He consecrated St. Giles's church in the same manner, which had been repaired, and part of it new built in his predecessor's (bishop Mountain) time.* Divine service had been performed, and the sacrament administered in it for three or four years since that time without exception; but as soon as Laud was advanced to the bishoprick of London, he interdicted the church, and prohibited divine service therein, till it should be reconsecrated, which is more than even the canon law requires. Sundry other chapels and churches, which had been built long since, were, by the bishop's direction, likewise shut up till they were consecrated in this manner; as Immanuel-chapel in Cambridge, built 1584, Sidney-college chapel, built 1596, and several others.

This method of consecrating churches was new to the people of England, and in the opinion of the first reformers superstitious and absurd; for though it is reasonable there should be public buildings reserved and set apart for public worship, and that at the first opening them, prayers should be offered for a divine blessing on the ordinances of Christ, that may at any time be administered in them; yet have we not the least ground to believe that bishops, or any other dignitaries of the church, can, by their declaration or forms of prayer, hallow the building, or make the ground holy, or introduce a divine presence or glory into the place, as was in the temple of old: where is their commission? or what example have we of this kind in the New Testament? The synagogues of the Jews were not consecrated in this manner; nor was the temple of Solomon consecrated by a priest, but by a king. Our Saviour tells his disciples, "that wheresoever two or three of them should be gathered together in his name, he would be in the midst of them;" and the woman of Samaria, "that the hour was coming, when neither at that mountain, nor at Jerusalem, they should worship the Father." Besides, the changes made by time and various accidents in towns and cities, render it impossible to prevent the alienation or profanation of holy ground; for to look no farther than the city of London, would it not

* Prynne Cant. Doom. p. 117.

be very hard if all the curses that bishop Laud pronounced in Creed-church, should rest upon those who live in houses built by act of parliament, in places where there were consecrated churches or churchyards before the fire of London? Archbishop Parker, therefore, in his "Antiquitates ecclesiæ Britan." p. 85, 86, condemns this practice as superstitious; nor was there any form for it in the public offices of the church. But this being objected to archbishop Laud at his trial, as an evidence of his inclinations to Popery; we shall there see his grace's defence, with the learned reply of the house of commons, concerning the antiquity of consecrating churches.

A proclamation had been published last year, "commanding the archbishops and bishops to take special care that the parish-churches in their several dioceses, being places consecrated to the worship of God, be kept in decent repair, and to make use of the power of the ecclesiastical court to oblige the parishioners to this part of their duty."* The judges were also required not to interrupt this good work, by too easily granting prohibitions from the spiritual courts. It seems, sundry churches since the reformation were fallen to decay; and some that had been defaced by the pulling down of images, and other Popish relics, had not been decently repaired, the expense being too heavy for the poorer country parishes; it was therefore thought necessary to oblige them to their duty; and under colour of this proclamation, Laud introduced many of the trappings and decorations of Popery, and punished those ministers in the high-commission court, that ventured to write or preach against them.

His lordship began with his own cathedral of St. Paul's, for repairing and beautifying of which, a subscription and contribution were appointed over the whole kingdom. Several houses and shops adjoining to the cathedral were, by injunction of council, ordered to be pulled down, and the owners to accept of a reasonable satisfaction: but if they would not comply, the sheriff of London was required to see them demolished. The church of St. Gregory was pulled down, and the inhabitants assigned to Christ-church, where they were to assemble for the future. The bishop's heart was in this work, and to support the expense, he gave way

* Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 98.

to many oppressions and unjustifiable methods of raising money, by compositions with recusants, commutations of penance, exorbitant fines in the star-chamber and high-commission, insomuch that it became a proverb, that St. Paul's was repaired with the sins of the people. Before the year 1640, above 113,000*l.* was expended thereon, with which the body of the church was finished, and the steeple scaffolded. There was also a stately portico built at the west end, supported with pillars of the Corinthian order, and embellished with the statues of king James and king Charles; but the rebuilding the spire and the inside decorations miscarried by the breaking out of the civil war.*

What these decorations and ornaments of paintings, carvings, altars, crucifixes, candlesticks, images, vestments, &c. would have been, can only be guessed by the fashion of the times, and by the scheme that was now formed to recover and repair the broken relics of superstition and idolatry which the Reformation had left, or to set up others in imitation of them; for though the reformation of queen Elizabeth had destroyed a great many monuments of this kind; yet some were left entire, and others very little defaced.† In the cathedral of Canterbury, over the door of the choir, remained thirteen images, or statues of stone; twelve of them representing the twelve apostles, and the thirteenth in the middle of them our Saviour Christ. Over these were twelve other images of Popish saints. In the several windows of the cathedral were painted, the picture of St. Austin the monk, the first bishop of that see, and seven large pictures of the Virgin Mary, with angels lifting her up to heaven, with this inscription, "Gaude Maria, sponsa Dei." Under the Virgin Mary's feet, were, the sun, moon, and stars, and in the bottom of the window this inscription, "In laudem & honorem beatissimæ Virginis." Besides these, were many pictures of God the Father, and of the Holy Ghost, and of our Saviour lying in a manger, and a large image of Thomas Becket, and others; all which were taken away by the long parliament.

In the cathedral of Durham, there was an altar of marble stone set upon columns decorated with cherubim, pictures, and images, which cost above 2,000*l.* There were three statues of stone in the church; one standing in the midst,

* Collyer's Eccl. Hist. p. 751. † Parl. Chron. p. 101.

representing Christ with a golden beard, a blue cap, and sun-rays upon his head, as the record of parliament says; though Dr. Cosins, in his vindication, says it was mistaken for the top of bishop Hatfield's tomb. There was also an image of God the Father, and many other carved images, pictures, &c. which the present dignitaries of the cathedral held in profound admiration; and to keep up the pomp, they bought copes of mass-priests, with crucifixes and images of the Trinity embroidered upon them. They had consecrated knives to cut the sacramental bread, and great numbers of lighted candles upon the altars on Sundays and saints' days. On Candlemas-day there were no less than two hundred, whereof sixty were upon and about the altar; all which were reckoned among the beauties of the sanctuary. "But these fopperies (says bishop Kennet) did not perhaps gain over one Papist, but lost both the king and bishops the hearts and affections of the Protestant part of the nation, and were (as his lordship observes) contrary to queen Elizabeth's injunctions, 1559, which appoint, that all candlesticks, trentals, rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, &c. be removed out of churches."*

However, bishop Laud was mightily enamoured with them, and as soon as he was translated to Lambeth, repaired the paintings in the windows of that chapel; in one pane of which had been the picture of Christ crucified, with a scull and dead men's bones under it; a basket full of tools and nails, with the high-priest and his officers on horseback and the two thieves on foot. In the next were the two thieves on crosses;—Abraham offering up his son Isaac, and the brazen serpent on a pole.—In other panes were the pictures of Christ rising out of the grave, and ascending up into heaven, with his disciples kneeling about him.—The descent of the Holy Ghost on the apostles, in the shape of cloven tongues.—God, giving the law upon mount Sinai;—his coming down from heaven at the prayer of Elisha;—Christ and his twelve apostles sitting in judgment on the world.—In other parts of the church were painted, the Virgin Mary, with the babe Christ sucking at her breast;—The wise men from the east coming to adore him;—The history of the Annunciation, with the picture of the Virgin Mary,

* Cant. Doom. p. 59—61.

and of the Holy Ghost overshadowing her, together with the birth of Christ. All which having been defaced at the Reformation, were now restored, according to the Roman missal, and beautified at the archbishop's cost. The like reparations of paintings, pictures, and crucifixes, were made in the king's chapel at Whitehall, Westminster-abbey, and both the universities, as was objected to the archbishop at his trial, where the reader will meet with his grace's defence of their lawfulness and antiquity. The Puritans apprehended these decorations of churches tended to image-worship, and were directly contrary to the homily of the peril of idolatry; their ministers therefore preached and wrote against them, and in some places removed them; for which they were severely handled in the high-commission.

Bishop Laud had been chosen chancellor of Oxford last year [April 12th, 1630], where the Puritans soon gave him some disturbance. Mr. Hill of Hart-hall, Mr. Ford of Magdalen-hall, Mr. Giles Thorne of Baliol-college, and Mr. Giles Hodges of Exeter-college, were charged with preaching against Arminianism and the new ceremonies in their sermons at St. Mary's. Hill made a public recantation, and was quickly released; but the very texts of the others, says Mr. Fuller,* gave offence: one preached on Numbers xiv. 4, "Let us make us a captain, and let us return into Egypt:" and another on 1 Kings xiii. 2, "And he cried against the altar in the word of the Lord, and said, O altar, altar," &c. These divines, being convened before the vice-chancellor Dr. Smith, as offenders against the king's instructions, appealed from the vice-chancellor to the proctors, who received their appeal. Upon this the chancellor complained to the king, and procured the cause to be heard before his majesty at Woodstock, August 23, when the following sentence was passed upon them: "that Mr. Ford, Thorne, and Hodges, be expelled the university; that both the proctors be deprived of their places for accepting the appeal; and that Dr. Prideaux rector of Exeter-college, and Dr. Wilkinson principal of Magdalen-hall, receive a sharp admonition for their misbehaviour in this business."† Mr. Thorne and Hodges, after a year's deprivation, desiring to be restored, preached a recantation sermon, and read a written submis-

* Church Hist. b. 11. p. 111. † Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 140.

sion in the convocation-house on their bended knees, before the doctors and regents;* but Mr. Ford, making no address to be restored, returned to his friends in Devonshire; and being like to be chosen lecturer or vicar of Plymouth, the inhabitants were required not to choose him, upon pain of his majesty's high displeasure; and in case he was chosen, the bishop of Exeter was commanded not to admit him.

Mr. Crowder, vicar of Vell near Nonsuch, was about this time committed close prisoner to Newgate for sixteen weeks, and then deprived by the high-commission, without any articles exhibited against him, or proof of a crime. It was pretended that matters against him were so foul, that they were not fit to be read in court; but then they ought to have been certified to him, that he might have had an opportunity to disprove or confess them, which could not be obtained. Mr. Crowder was a pious man, and preached twice a day, which was an unpardonable crime so near the court.

Sundry eminent divines removed to New England this year; and among others the famous Dr. Elliot, the apostle of the Indians, who, not being allowed to teach school in his native country, retired to America, and spent a long and useful life in converting the natives, and with indefatigable pains translated the Bible into the Indian language.

Two very considerable Puritan divines were also removed into the other world by death, viz. Mr. Arthur Hildersham, born at Stochworth, Cambridgeshire, October 6th, 1563, and educated in Christ's-college, Cambridge, of an ancient and honourable family; his mother Anne Poole being niece to the cardinal of that name. His father educated him in the Popish religion; and, because he would not go to Rome at fourteen or fifteen years of age, disinherited him: but the earl of Huntingdon, his near kinsman, provided for him, sending him to Cambridge, where he proceeded M. A. and entered into holy orders. In the year 1587, he was placed by his honourable kinsman above mentioned, at Ashby-de-la-Zouch in Leicestershire, and inducted into that living soon after.† But here he was silenced for nonconformity, as in the year 1590, in the year 1605, and again in the year 1611, under which last suspension he continued many years. In the year 1613 he was enjoined by the high-commission not

* Prynne, Cant. Doom, p. 175.
† Clarke's Life of Hildersham, annexed to his General Martyrology, p. 114.

to preach, or exercise any part of the ministerial function, till he should be restored. In the year 1615, he was committed to the Fleet by the high-commission, for refusing the oath *ex officio*, where he continued three months, and was then released upon bond. In November 1616, the high-commission proceeded against him, and pronounced him refractory and disobedient to the orders, rites, and ceremonies, of the church; and because he refused to conform, declared him a schismatic, fined him 2,000*l.* excommunicated him, and ordered him to be attached and committed to prison, that he might be degraded of his ministry: but Mr. Hildersham wisely absconded, and kept out of the way. In the year 1625, he was restored to his living; but when Laud had the ascendant, he was silenced again for not reading divine service in the surplice and hood, and was not restored till a few months before his death. Though he was a Nonconformist in principle, as appears by his last will and testament, yet he was a person of great temper and moderation:* he loved and respected all good men, and opposed the separation of the Brownists, and the semi-separation of Mr. Jacob. His lectures on the fifty-first psalm, and his other printed works, as well as the encomiums of Dr. Willet and Dr. Preston, show him to have been a most excellent divine: what a pity was it that his usefulness in the church should be so long interrupted! He died March 4, 1631, in the sixty-ninth year of his age, having been minister of Ashby-de-la-Zouch, as the times would suffer him, above forty-three years.

Mr. Robert Bolton, was born at Blackburn in Lancashire, 1572, educated first in Lincoln-college, and afterward in Brazen-nose-college, Oxford, of which he was fellow. Here he became famous for his lectures in moral and natural philosophy, being an excellent Grecian,† and well versed in school-divinity, while he continued a profane wicked man. During his residence at college, he contracted an acquaintance with one Anderton a Popish priest, who, taking advantage of his mean circumstances, would have persuaded him to reconcile himself to the church of Rome,

* "He dissented not from the Church in any article of faith, but only about wearing the surplice, baptizing with the cross, and kneeling at the sacrament." Granger's History of England, vol. 1. p. 371. 8vo. Ed.

† The Greek language was so familiar to him, that he could speak it with almost as much facility as his mother-tongue.—Ed.

and go over to one of the English seminaries in Flanders. Mr. Bolton accepted the motion, and appointed a place of meeting to conclude the affair: but Anderton disappointing him, he returned to the college, and fell under strong convictions for his former mispent life; so that he could neither eat nor sleep, or enjoy any peace of mind, for several months; till at length, by prayer and humiliation, he received comfort. Upon this, he resolved to enter upon the ministry, in the thirty-fifth year of his age. About two years after he was presented to the living of Broughton in Northamptonshire, where he continued till his death. He was a most awakening and authoritative preacher, having the most strong masculine and oratorical style of any of the age in which he lived. He preached twice every Lord's day, besides catechising. Upon every holy day, and every Friday, before the sacrament, he expounded a chapter: his constant course was to pray six times a day, twice in secret, twice with his family, and twice with his wife, besides many days of private humiliation that he observed for the Protestant churches in Germany. He was of a comely grave presence, which commanded respect in all companies; zealous in the cause of religion, and yet so prudent as to escape being called in question all the time he lived in Northamptonshire. At length he was seized with a tertain ague, which, after fifteen weeks, put a period to his valuable and useful life, December 17, 1631, in the sixtieth year of his age. He made a most devout and exemplary end, praying heartily for all his friends that came to see him; bidding them make sure of heaven, and bear in mind what he had formerly told them in his ministry, protesting that what he had preached to them for twenty years, was the truth of God, as he should answer it at the tribunal of Christ. He then retired within himself, and said, Hold out faith and patience, your work will speedily be at an end. The Oxford historian* calls him a most religious and learned Puritan, a painful and constant preacher, a person of great zeal towards God, charitable and bountiful: but above all, an excellent casuist for afflicted consciences: his eloquent and excellent writings will recommend his memory to the latest posterity.†

* Athenæ Oxon. vol. i. p. 479; see also Fuller's Abel Redivivus, p. 506.

† When he lay at the point of death, one of his friends, taking him by the hand,

About the year 1627, there was a scheme formed by several gentlemen and ministers to promote preaching in the country, by setting up lectures in the several market-towns of England; and to defray the expense a sum of money was raised by voluntary contribution, for the purchasing such impropriations as were in the hands of the laity, the profits of which were to be parcelled out into salaries of 40 or 50*l.* per annum for the subsistence of their lecturers; the money was deposited in the hands of the following ministers and gentlemen, in trust for the abovesaid purposes, under the name and character of feoffees, viz. Dr. William Gouge, Dr. Sibbs, Dr. Offspring, and Mr. Davenport, of the clergy; Ralph Eyre and Simon Brown, esqrs. of Lincoln's inn, and C. Sherman, of Gray's inn, and John White, of the Middle-Temple, esqrs. lawyers; Mr. John Gearing, Mr. Richard Davis, Mr. G. Harwood, and Mr. Francis Bridges, citizens of London. There were at this time three thousand eight hundred and forty-five parish-churches appropriated to cathedrals, or to colleges, or impropriated as lay fees to private persons, having formerly belonged to abbeys. The gentlemen above mentioned dealt only in the latter, and had already bought in thirteen impropriations, which cost between 5 and 6,000*l.* Most people thought this a very laudable design, and wished the feoffees good success; but bishop Laud looked on them with an evil eye, and represented them to the king as in a conspiracy against the church, because, instead of restoring the impropriations they purchased to the several livings, they kept them in their own hands for the encouragement of factious and seditious lecturers, who were to depend upon their patrons, as being liable to be turned out if they neglected their duty.* He added farther, that the feoffees preferred chiefly Nonconformist ministers, and placed them in the most popular market-towns, where they did a great deal of mischief to the hierarchy. For these reasons an information was brought against them in the exchequer by Mr. attorney-

---

asked him if he was not in great pain? "Truly (said he) the greatest pain I feel is your cold hand;" and presently expired. His book "on Happiness" was the most celebrated of his works, and has gone through many editions. Granger's History of England, vol. 1. p. 365. 8vo.; and Fuller's Abel Redivivus, p. 501.—Ed.

* Fuller's Church History, b. 11. p. 136. Appeal, p. 15. Prynne, p. 379. 385. Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 150.

general Noy, as an illicit society, formed into a body corporate, without a grant from the king, for the purchasing rectories, tithes, prebendaries, &c. which were registered in a book, and the profits not employed according to law.

The defendants appeared, and in their answer declared, that they apprehended impropriations in the hands of laymen, and not employed for the maintenance of preachers, were a damage to the church; that the purchasing of them for the purposes of religion was a pious work, and not contrary to law, it being notorious, that impropriations are frequently bought and sold by private persons; that the donors of this money gave it for this and such other good uses as the defendants should think meet, and not for the endowment of perpetual vicars; that they had not converted any of the money to their own use, nor erected themselves into a body corporate; and that to their knowledge they had never presented any to a church, or place in their disposal, who was not conformable to the doctrine and discipline of the church of England, and approved of by the ordinary of the place. But notwithstanding all they could say, the court was of opinion, that their proceedings were contrary to law, and decreed that their *feoffment* should be cancelled; that the impropriations they had purchased should be confiscated to the king, and the feoffees themselves fined in the star-chamber; however, the prosecution was dropped as too invidious, it appearing in court by the receipts and disbursements, that the feoffees were out of pocket already above 1,000*l*. The odium of this prosecution fell upon Laud, whose chancellor told him upon this occasion, that he was miserably censured by the Separatists; upon which he made this reflection in his diary, "Pray God give me patience, and forgive them."

But his lordship had very little patience with those who opposed his proceedings. We have seen his zeal for pictures and paintings in churches, which some of the Puritans venturing to censure in their sermons and writings, were exposed to the severest punishments: among these was the reverend Mr. *John* Hayden of Devonshire, who being forced to abscond, was apprehended in the diocess of Norwich by bishop Harsnet, who, after he had taken from him his horse and money, and all his papers, caused him to be

shut up in close prison for thirteen weeks;* after which, when the justices would have admitted him to bail at the quarter-sessions, his lordship sent him up to the high-commission, who deprived him of his ministry and orders, and set a fine upon him for preaching against decorations and images in churches. In the year 1634, Mr. Hayden venturing to preach occasionally, without being restored, was apprehended again and sent to the Gatehouse by archbishop Laud, and from thence to Bridewell, where he was whipped and kept to hard labour; here he was confined in a cold dark dungeon during a whole winter, being chained to a post in the middle of a room, with irons on his hands and feet, having no other food but bread and water, and a pad of straw to lie on. Before his release he was obliged to take an oath, and give bond, that he would preach no more, but depart the kingdom in a month, and not return. Bishop Harsnet did not live to see the execution of this part of the sentence,† though for his zeal against the Puritans he was promoted to the archbishop of York, and made a privy-counsellor. Sometime before his decease he not only persecuted the Nonconformists, but complained of the conformable Puritans, as he called them, because they complied out of policy and not in judgment. How hard is the case, when men shall be punished for not conforming, and be complained of if they conform! Queen Elizabeth used to say, she would never trouble herself about the consciences of her subjects, if they did but outwardly comply with the laws; whereas this prelate would ransack the very heart.

Henry Sherfield, esq. a bencher of Lincoln's inn, and recorder of the city of Sarum, was tried in the star-chamber, May 20, 1632,‡ for taking down some painted glass out of one of the windows of St. Edmund's church in Salisbury, in which were seven pictures of God the Father in form of a little old man in a blue and red coat, with a pouch by his side: one represents him creating the sun and moon with a pair of compasses, others as working on the business of the six days' creation, and at last he sits in an elbow-chair at rest.§ Many simple people, at their going in and out of church, did reverence to this window (as they say), because

* Usurpation of Prelates, p. 161, 162. † Fuller's Church History, b. 11. p. 144.
‡ Rushworth, part 2. vol. 1. p. 153-156. § Prynne's Cant. Doom. p. 102.

the Lord their God was there. This gave such offence to the recorder, who was also a justice of peace, that he moved the parish at a vestry for leave to take it down, and set up a new window of white glass in the place, which was accordingly granted, six justices of the peace being present. Sometime after Mr. Sherfield broke with his staff the pictures of God the Father, in order to new glaze the window; an account of which being transmitted to London, an information was exhibited against him in the star-chamber, February 8, 1632—3. The information sets forth, "that being evil affected to the discipline of the church, he, with certain confederates, without consent of the bishops, had defaced and pulled down a fair and costly window in the church, containing the history of the creation, which had stood there some hundred years, and was a great ornament to it; which profane act might give encouragement to other schismatical persons to commit the like outrages."

Mr. Sherfield in his defence says, that the church of St. Edmund's was a lay fee, and exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese; that the defendant, with the rest of the parishioners, had lawful power to take down the glass; and that it was agreed by a vestry that the glass should be changed, and the window made new; and that accordingly he took down a quarry or two in a quiet and peaceable manner; but he avers, that the true history of the creation was not contained in that window, but a false and impious one: God the Father was painted like an old man with a blue coat, and a pair of compasses, to signify his compassing the heavens and earth. In the fourth day's work there were fowls of the air flying up from God their maker, which should have been the fifth day. In the fifth day's work a naked man is laying upon the earth asleep, with so much of a naked woman as from the knees upward growing out of his side, which should have been the sixth day; so that the history is false.

Farther, this defendant holds it to be impious, to make an image or picture of God the Father, which he undertakes to prove from Scripture, from canons and councils, from the mandates and decrees of sundry emperors, from the opinions of ancient doctors of the church, and of our most judicious divines since the Reformation. He adds, that his belief is agreeable to the doctrine of the church of England, and to

the homilies, which say, that pictures of God are monuments of superstition, and ought to be destroyed; and to queen Elizabeth's injunctions, which command, that all pictures and monuments of idolatry should be removed out of churches, that no memory of them might remain in walls, glass-windows, or elsewhere: which injunction is confirmed by the canons of the 13th of Elizabeth. Mr. Sherfield concludes his defence with denying, that he was disaffected to the discipline of the church of England, or had encouraged any to oppose the government of it under the reverend bishops.

Though it is hard to make a tolerable reply to this defence, yet bishop Laud stood up and spake in excuse of the painter, saying, God the Father was called in Scripture the Ancient of Days; adding, however, that for his own part, he did not so well approve of pictures of things invisible; but be the paintings better or worse, he insisted strongly, that Mr. Sherfield had taken them down in contempt of the episcopal authority, for which he moved, that he might be fined 1,000*l.* and removed from his recordership of the city of Sarum; that he be committed close prisoner to the Fleet till he pay his fine, and then be bound to his good behaviour. To all which the court agreed, except to the fine, which was mitigated to 500*l.*

The reverend Mr. John Workman, lecturer of St. Stephen's church, Gloucester, in one of his sermons, asserted, that pictures or images were no ornaments to churches; that it was unlawful to set up images of Christ or saints in our houses, because it tended to idolatry, according to the homily.* For this he was suspended by the high commission, excommunicated, and obliged to an open recantation in the court at Lambeth, in the cathedral of Gloucester, and in the church of St. Michael's; he was also condemned in costs of suit and imprisoned. Mr. Workman was a man of great piety, wisdom, and moderation, and had served the church of St. Stephen's fifteen years; in consideration whereof, and of his numerous family, the city of Gloucester had given him an annuity of 20*l.* per annum, under their common seal, a little before his troubles; but for this act of charity, the mayor, town-clerk, and several of the aldermen, were cited before the high-commission, and put to 100*l.*

* Prynne, p. 107. 109.

charges, and the annuity was cancelled. After this Mr. Workman set up a little school, of which archbishop Laud being informed, inhibited him, as he would answer the contrary at his peril. He then fell upon the practice of physic, which the archbishop likewise absolutely forbid; so that, being deprived of all methods of subsistence, he fell into a melancholy disorder and died.

Our bishop was no less watchful over the press than the pulpit, commanding his chaplains to expunge out of all books that came to be licensed, such passages as disallowed of paintings, carvings, drawings, gildings; erecting, bowing, or praying before images and pictures; as appeared by the evidence of Dr. Featly and others at his trial.

This great prelate would have stretched out his arm not only against the Puritans in England, but even to reach the factories beyond sea, had it been in his power. The English church at Hamburgh managed their affairs according to the Geneva discipline, by elders and deacons. In Holland they conformed to the discipline of the States, and met them in their synods and assemblies, with the consent of king James, and of his present majesty, till secretary Windebank, at the instance of this prelate, offered some proposals to the privy-council for their better regulation:* the proposals consisted of ten articles: "1. That all chaplains of English regiments in the Low Countries shall be exactly conformable to the church of England. 2. That the merchants residing there shall admit of no minister to preach among them, but one qualified as before. 3. That if any one after his settlement among them prove a Nonconformist, he shall be discharged in three months. 4. That the Scots factories shall be obliged to the same conformity. 5. That no minister abroad shall speak, preach, or print, any thing to the disadvantage of the English discipline and ceremonies. 6. That no Conformist minister shall substitute a Nonconformist to preach for him in the factories. 7. That the king's agents shall see the service of the church of England exactly performed in the factories.—The last articles forbid the English ministers in Holland to hold any classical assemblies, and especially not to ordain ministers, because by so doing they would maintain a standing nursery for Nonconformity and schism." These proposals were dispatched to the factories,

* Collyer's Eccles. Hist. p. 710, 711. Prynn's Cant. Doom. p. 380.

and the bishop wrote in particular to Delft, that it was his majesty's express command, that their ministers should conform themselves in all things to the doctrine and discipline of the church of England, and to all the orders prescribed in the canons, rubric, and liturgy; and that the names of such as were refractory should be sent over to him. But it was not possible to succeed in the attempt, because most of the English congregations, being supported by the States, must by so doing have run the hazard of losing their maintenance, and of being dissolved, as was represented to the king by a petition in the name of all the English ministers in the Low Countries. However, though the bishop could not accomplish his designs abroad, we shall find him hereafter retaliating his disappointment upon the French and Dutch churches at home.

His lordship met with better success in Scotland for the present, as being part of his majesty's own dominions. He had possessed the king with vast notions of glory in bringing the kirk of Scotland to an exact conformity with England; a work which his father had attempted, but left imperfect. The king readily fell in with the bishop's motion, and determined to run all hazards for accomplishing this important design, having no less veneration for the ceremonies of the church of England than the bishop himself. There had been bishops in Scotland for some years, but they had little more than the name, being subject to an assembly that was purely presbyterian. To advance their jurisdiction, the king had already renewed the high-commission, and abolished all general assemblies of the kirk, not one having been held in his reign; yet still, says the noble historian,* there was no form of religion, no liturgy, nor the least appearance of any beauty of holiness. To redress these grievances, as well as to shew the Scots nation the pomp and grandeur of the English hierarchy, his majesty resolves upon a progress into his native country to be crowned, and accordingly set out from London, May 13, attended by several noblemen and persons of quality; and among others by bishop Laud. June 18 [1633], his majesty was crowned at Edinburgh, the ceremony being managed by the direction of his favourite bishop, who thrust away the bishop of Glasgow from his place, because he appeared without the coat of his order,

* Clarendon, vol. i. p. 81.

which being an embroidered one, he scrupled to wear, being a moderate churchman.*

On the 20th of June the parliament met, and voted the king a large sum of money. After which his majesty proposed to them two acts relating to religion; one was concerning his royal prerogative, and the apparel of kirkmen; the other, a bill for the ratification of former acts touching religion. It being the custom in Scotland for king, lords, and commons, to sit in one house, when the question was put for the first bill, his majesty took a paper out of his pocket, and said, "Gentlemen, I have all your names here, and I will know who will do me service, and who will not, this day." Nevertheless it was carried in the negative; thirteen lords, and the majority of the commons, voting against it. The lords said, they agreed to the act so far as related to his majesty's prerogative, but dissented from that part of it which referred to the apparel of kirkmen, fearing that under that cover the surplice might be introduced. But his majesty said, he would have no distinction, and commanded them to say yea, or no, to the whole bill. The king marked every man's vote, and upon casting them up the clerk declared it was carried in the affirmative: which some of the members denying, his majesty said, the clerk's declaration must stand, unless any would go to the bar and accuse him of falsifying the record of parliament, at the peril of his life.†

This manner of treating the whole representative body of the nation, disgusted all ranks and orders of his subjects. A writing was immediately dispersed abroad, setting forth how grievous it was for a king to overawe and threaten his parliament in that manner; and that the same was a breach of privilege; that parliaments were a mere pageantry, if the clerk might declare the votes as he pleased, and no scrutiny be allowed. Lord Balmerino, in whose custody this libel was found, was condemned to lose his head for it, but was afterward pardoned.

After eight days the parliament was dissolved, but the king would not look upon the dissenting lords, or admit them to kiss his hand. The act concerning the apparel of ministers, says, that "Whereas it was agreed in the parliament of 1606, that what order soever his majesty's father, of

* Rushworth, part 2. vol. 1 p. 112. † Ibid. p. 123.

blessed memory, should prescribe for the apparel of kirkmen, and send in writ to his clerk of register, should be a sufficient warrant for inserting the same in the books of parliament, to have the strength of any act thereof; the present parliament agrees, that the same power shall remain with our sovereign lord that now is, and his successors." The bill touching religion ratifies and approves all acts and statutes made before, about the liberty and freedom of the true kirk of God, and the religion at present professed within this kingdom, and ordains the same to stand in full force as if they were particularly mentioned.

The king left his native country July 16, having lost a great deal of ground in the affections of his people,* by the contempt he poured upon the Scots clergy, and his high behaviour in favour of the English ceremonies. His majesty was attended throughout his whole progress by Laud bishop of London, which service his lordship was not obliged to, and no doubt would have been excused from, if the design of introducing the English liturgy into Scotland had not been in view.† He preached before the king in the royal chapel at Edinburgh, which scarce any Englishman had ever done before, and insisted principally upon the benefit of the ceremonies of the church, which he himself observed to the height. It went against him to own the Scots presbyters for ministers of Christ; taking all occasions to affront their character, which created a high disgust in that nation, and laid the foundation of those

* Dr. Grey confronts Mr. Neal here with a passage from lord Clarendon to show that his account of the king's reception in Scotland differs widely from this of our author. "The great civility of that people (says his lordship) being so notorious and universal, that they would not appear unconformable to his majesty's wish in any particular." But this quotation has little or no force against Mr. Neal, who is not representing the reception the king met with, but the impressions left on the minds of the people by the time of his departure. The king's entry and coronation, bishop Burnet says, was managed with such magnificence, that all was entertainment and show: yet, he adds, "that the king left Scotland much discontented." The proceeding on the bill concerning the royal prerogative, &c. show, that every proposal from the court was not pleasing. Whitelocke (Memoirs, p. 18) tells us, that though the king was crowned with all show of affection and duty, and gratified many with new honours; yet, before he left Scotland, some began to murmur and afterward to mutiny; and he was in some danger passing over Dumfrith. And such in particular was the effect of the prosecution of lord Balmerino on the public mind, that the ruin of the king's affairs in Scotland was in a great measure owing to it. Dr. Grey refers to the preambles to some acts passed in the Scotch parliament, as proving the high degree of esteem the king was then in amongst them; as if an argument were to be drawn from formularies drawn up according to the routine of the occasion, and composed, probably, by a court lawyer: as if such formularies were proof against matter of fact. Burnet's History of his Own Times, vol. 1. p. 24—31, 12mo.—Ed.

† Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 81, 82.

resentments that they expressed against him under his sufferings.

When the king left Scotland, he erected a new bishoprick at Edinburgh; and about two months after, Laud, being then newly advanced to the province of Canterbury, framed articles for the reformation of his majesty's royal chapel in that city, which were sent into Scotland under his majesty's own hand, with a declaration, that they were intended as a pattern for all cathedrals, chapels, and parish-churches, in that kingdom.* The articles appoint, "that prayers be read twice a day in the choir, according to the English liturgy, till some course be taken to make one that may fit the custom and constitution of that church. That all that receive the sacrament in the chapel do it kneeling. That the dean of the chapel always come to church in his whites, and preach in them. That the copes which are consecrated to our use be carefully kept, and used at the celebration of the sacrament; and that all his majesty's officers and ministers of state be obliged, at least once a year, to receive the sacrament at the royal chapel, kneeling, for an example to the rest of the people." Thus were the liberties of the kirk of Scotland invaded by an English bishop, under the wing of the supremacy, without consent of parliament or general assembly. The Scots ministers in their pulpits preached against the English hierarchy, and warned the people against surrendering up the liberties of their kirk into the hands of a neighbouring nation, that was undermining their discipline; so that when the new liturgy came to be introduced about four years after, all the people as one man rose up against it.

The king was no sooner returned from Scotland than Dr. Abbot archbishop of Canterbury died. He was born at Guilford in Surrey 1562, and educated in Baliol-college, Oxford, where he was a celebrated preacher. In the year 1597, he proceeded doctor in divinity, and was elected master of University-college: two years after he was made dean of Winchester, and was one of those divines appointed by king James to translate the New Testament into English. In the year 1609, he was consecrated bishop of Litchfield and Coventry, from thence he was translated to London,

* Rushworth, part 2. vol. 2. p. 304, 400.

and upon the death of archbishop Bancroft, to Canterbury, April 9, 1611, having never been rector, vicar, or incumbent, in any parish-church in England. Lord Clarendon* has lessened the character of this excellent prelate, contrary to almost all other historians, by saying that "he was a man of very morose manners, and of a very sour aspect, which in that time was called gravity; that he neither understood nor regarded the constitution of the church; that he knew very little of ancient divinity, but adhered stiffly to the doctrine of Calvin, and did not think so ill of his discipline as he ought to have done; but if men prudently forbore a public reviling and railing at the hierarchy, let their private practice be as it would, he would give them no disturbance; that his house was a sanctuary to disaffected persons, and that he licensed their writings, by which means his successor [Laud] had a very difficult task to reduce things to order." The Oxford historian,† who was no friend to our archbishop's principles, confesses that he was a pious grave person, exemplary in his life and conversation, a plausible preacher, and that the many things he has written shew him to be a man of parts, learning, and vigilance; an able statesman, and of unwearied study, though overwhelmed with business. Fuller‡ says, he was an excellent preacher, and that his severity towards the clergy was only to prevent their being punished by lay judges, to their greater shame. Mr. Coke and Dr. Welwood§ add, that he was a prelate of primitive sanctity, who followed the true interests of his country, and of the reformed churches at home and abroad; that he was a divine of good learning, great hospitality, and wonderful moderation, shewing upon all occasions an unwillingness to stretch the king's prerogative or the act of uniformity, beyond what was consistent with law, or necessary for the peace of the church; this brought him into all his troubles, and has provoked the writers for the prerogative, to leave a blot upon his memory, which on this account will be reverenced by all true lovers of the Protestant religion, and the liberties of their country; and if the court had followed his wise and prudent counsels, the mischiefs that befel the crown and

* Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 88, 89.
† Athenæ Oxon. vol. 1. p. 499.
‡ Church History, b. 11. p. 133.
§ Welwood's Memoirs, p. 36. edit. 1718.

church some years after his death, would have been prevented. We have mentioned his casual homicide in the year 1621, which occasioned his keeping an annual fast as long as he lived, and maintaining the widow. Notwithstanding this misfortune, if he would have betrayed the Protestant religion, and been the dupe of the prerogative, he might have continued in high favour with his prince; but for his steady opposition to the arbitrary measures of Buckingham and Laud, and for not licensing Sibthorp's sermon, he was suspended from his archiepiscopal jurisdiction, [1628*], whereupon he retired to Croydon, having no more interest at court, or influence in the government of the church; here he died in his archiepiscopal palace, August 4, 1633, aged seventy-one, and was buried in Trinity-church in Guilford, the place of his nativity, where he had erected and endowed an hospital for men and women. There is a fine monument over his grave, with his effigies in full proportion, supported by six pillars of the Doric order of black marble, standing on six pedestals of piled books, with a large inscription thereon to his memory.†

* Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 435.

† In addition to our author's character of archbishop Abbot, it may be observed that Dr. Warner has entered largely into the description of it, "not only (he says) in conformity to the rule he prescribed to himself in his work, but (he adds) to rescue the memory of this prelate from the injury done to it by lord Clarendon, with so notorious a partiality as does no honour to his history." The doctor sums up his view of archbishop Abbot's character, by saying, "that he was a man of good parts and learning as a divine; that he was a prelate of a very pious exemplary conversation; and an archbishop who understood the constitution of his country in church and state, to which he steadfastly adhered, without any regard to the favour or the frowns of princes." The learned translator of Mosheim also censures lord Clarendon's account of this eminent prelate as most unjust and partial: and in a long note, ably and judiciously appreciates the archbishop's merit and excellence. It was, he shows, by the zeal and dexterity of Abbot, that things were put into such a situation in Scotland as afterward produced the entire establishment of the episcopal order in that nation. It was by the mild and prudent counsels of Abbot, when he was chaplain to the lord-high-treasurer Dunbar, that there was passed a famous act of the general assembly of Scotland, which gave the king the authority of calling all general assemblies, and investing the bishops, or their deputies, with various powers of interference and influence over the Scotch ministers. These facts confute the charge of his disregarding the constitution of the church. It deserves to be mentioned, that this prelate had a considerable hand in the translation of the New Testament now in use. Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 4. p. 513, and note (f.) 1768. Warner's Eccles. History, vol. 2. p. 522—524. Granger's Biogr. History of England, vol. 1. p. 311. 8vo.—Ed.

CHAP. IV.

FROM THE DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP ABBOT TO THE BEGINNING OF THE COMMOTIONS IN SCOTLAND, IN THE YEAR 1637.

Dr. Laud was now at the pinnacle of preferment, being translated to the see of Canterbury two days after archbishop Abbot's death. His grace was likewise chancellor of the universities of Oxford and Dublin, privy-counsellor for England and Scotland, first commissioner of the exchequer, and one of the committee for trade, and for the king's revenues: he was also offered a cardinal's cap [August 17], which he declined, as he says, because there was something dwelt within him which would not suffer it, till Rome was otherwise than it was. We are now to see how he moved in this high sphere. Lord Clarendon admits, "that the archbishop had all his life eminently opposed Calvin's doctrine, for which reason he was called a Papist; and it may be (says his lordship) the Puritans found the more severe and rigorous usage for propagating the calumny. He also intended, that the discipline of the church should be felt as well as spoken of." The truth of this observation has appeared in part already, and will receive stronger evidence from the seven ensuing years of his government.

The archbishop's antipathy to Calvinism, and zeal for the external beauty of the church, carried him to some very imprudent and unjustifiable extremes: for if the Puritans were too strict in keeping holy the sabbath, his grace was too lax in his indulgence, by encouraging revels, may-games, and sports, on that sacred day.

Complaint having been made to the lord-chief-justice Richardson, and baron Denham, in their western circuit, of great inconveniences arising from revels, church-ales, and clerk-ales, on the Lord's day, the two judges made an order at the assizes for suppressing them, and appointed the clerk to leave copies of the order with every parish-minister, who was to give a note under his hand, to publish it in his church yearly, the first Sunday in February, and the two Sundays before Easter.* Upon the return of the cir-

* Prynne's Cant. Doom. p. 103.

cuit the judges required an account of the execution of their order, and punished some persons for the breach of it; whereupon the archbishop complained to the king of their invading the episcopal jurisdiction, and prevailed with his majesty to summons them before the council. When they appeared, Richardson pleaded that the order was made at the request of the justices of the peace, and with the unanimous consent of the whole bench, and justified it from the following precedents: September 10, Eliz. 38th, the justices assembled at Bridgewater ordered, that no church-ale, clerk-ale, or bid-ale, be suffered; signed by Popham, lord-chief-justice, and ten others. The same order was repeated 1599, and 41st of Eliz. and again at Exeter, 1615, and 13th of Jac. and even in the present king's reign, 1627, with an order for the minister of every parish-church to publish it yearly. But notwithstanding all the chief justice could allege, he received a sharp reprimand, and a peremptory injunction to revoke his order at the next assizes; which he did in such a manner as lost him his credit at court for the future; for he then declared to the justices, "that he thought he had done God, the king, and his country, good service, by that good order that he and his brother Denham had made, for suppressing unruly wakes and revels, but that it had been misreported to his majesty, who had expressly charged him to reverse it; accordingly (says he) I do, as much as in me lies, reverse it, declaring the same to be null and void, and that all persons may use their recreations at such meetings as before." This reprimand and injunction almost broke the judge's heart, for when he came out of the council-chamber he told the earl of Dorset with tears in his eyes, that he had been miserably shaken by the archbishop, and was like to be choked with his lawn-sleeves.

Laud having thus humbled the judge, and recovered his episcopal authority from neglect, took the affair into his own hand, and wrote to the bishop of Bath and Wells October 4 [1633] for fuller information. In his letter he takes notice that there had been of late some noise in Somersetshire about the wakes; that the judges had prohibited them under pretence of some disorders, by which argument, says he, any thing that is abused may be quite taken away; but that his majesty was displeased with

Richardson's behaviour at the two last assizes, and especially the last; being of opinion, that the feasts ought to be kept for the recreation of the people, of which he would not have them debarred under any frivolous pretences, to the gratifying of the humorists, who were very numerous in those parts, and united in crying down the feasts; his grace therefore requires the bishop to give him a speedy account how these feasts had been ordered.

Pierce bishop of Bath and Wells, in answer to this letter, acquaints the archbishop, "that the late suppression of the revels was very unacceptable, and that the restitution of them would be very grateful to the gentry, clergy, and common people;* for proof of which he had procured the hands of seventy-two of his clergy, in whose parishes these feasts are kept; and he believes that if he had sent for a hundred more he should have had the same answer from them all; but these seventy-two (says his lordship) are like the seventy-two interpreters that agreed so soon in the translation of the Old Testament in the Greek." He then proceeds to explain the nature of these feasts: "There are (says he) in Somersetshire, not only feasts of dedication [or revel-days], but also church-ales, clerk-ales, and bid-ales."

"The feasts of Dedication are in memory of the dedication of the several churches; those churches dedicated to the holy Trinity have their feasts on Trinity-Sunday; and so all the feasts are kept upon the Sunday before or after the saint's day to whom the churches are dedicated, because the people have not leisure to observe them on the week-days; this (says his lordship) is acceptable to the people, who otherwise go into tippling-houses, or else to conventicles.

"Church-ales are, when the people go from afternoon-prayers on Sunday to their lawful sports and pastimes in the churchyard, or in the neighbourhood, in some public-house, where they drink and make merry. By the benevolence of the people at these pastimes, many poor parishes have cast their bells, and beautified their churches, and raised stocks for the poor; and there had not been observed so much disorder at them as is commonly at fairs or markets.

"Clerk-ales [or lesser church-ales] are so called, be-

* Cant. Doom. p. 142.

cause they were for the better maintenance of the parish-clerk; and there is great reason for them (says his lordship), for in poor country parishes, where the wages of the clerk are but small, the people, thinking it unfit that the clerk should duly attend at church and gain by his office, send him in provision, and then come on Sundays and feast with him, by which means he sells more ale, and tastes more of the liberality of the people, than their quarterly payment would amount to in many years; and since these have been put down, many ministers have complained to me (says his lordship) that they are afraid they shall have no parish-clerks.

"A bid-ale is, when a poor man, decayed in his substance, is set up again by the liberal benevolence and contribution of his friends at a Sunday's feast."

The people were fond of these recreations, and the bishop recommends them, as bringing the people more willingly to church; as tending to civilize them, and to compose differences among them; and as serving to increase love and unity, forasmuch as they were in the nature of feasts of charity, the richer sort keeping in a manner open house; for which and some other reasons his lordship thinks them fit to be retained.

But the justices of peace were of another mind, and signed an humble petition to the king, in which they declare that these revels had not only introduced a great profanation of the Lord's day, but riotous tippling, contempt of authority, quarrels, murders, &c. and were very prejudicial to the peace, plenty, and good government, of the country, and therefore they pray that they be suppressed. Here we observe the laity petitioning for the religious observation of the Lord's day, and the bishop with his clergy pleading for the profanation of it.

To encourage these disorderly assemblies more effectually, archbishop Laud put the king upon republishing his father's declaration of the year 1618, concerning lawful sports to be used on Sundays after divine service; which was done accordingly, October 18, with this remarkable addition. After a recital of the words of king James's declaration, his majesty adds, "Out of a like pious care for the service of God, and for suppressing of those humours that oppose truth, and for the ease, comfort, and recreation

of his majesty's well-deserving people, he doth ratify his blessed father's declaration, the rather, because of late in some counties of the kingdom his majesty finds, that, under pretence of taking away an abuse, there hath been a general forbidding, not only of ordinary meetings, but of the feasts of the dedication of churches, commonly called wakes; it is therefore his will and pleasure, that these feasts with others shall be observed, and that all neighbourhood and freedom with manlike and lawful exercises be used; and the justices of the peace are commanded not to molest any in their recreations, having first done their duty to God, and continued in obedience to his majesty's laws." And he does farther will, "that publication of this his command be made by order from the bishops, through all the parish-churches of their several dioceses respectively."

This declaration revived the controversy of the morality of the sabbath, which had slept for many years; Mr. Theophilus Bradbourne, a Suffolk minister, had published, in the year 1628, "A defence of the most ancient and sacred ordinance of God, the sabbath-day," and dedicated it to the king. But Mr. Fuller* observes, "that the poor man fell into the ambush of the high-commission, whose well tempered severity so prevailed with him, that he became a convert, and conformed quietly to the church of England." Francis White, bishop of Ely, was commanded by the king to confute Bradbourne; and after him appeared Dr. Pocklington, with his "Sunday no sabbath;" and after him Heylin the archbishop's chaplain, and others. These divines, instead of *softening* some rigours in Bradbourne's sabbatarian strictness, ran into the contrary extreme, denying all manner of divine right or moral obligation to the observance of the whole or any part of the Lord's day, making it depend entirely upon ecclesiastical authority, and to oblige no farther than to the few hours of public service; and that in the intervals, not only walking (which the Sabbatarians admitted) but mixed dancing, masks, interludes, revels, &c. were lawful and expedient.

Instead of convincing the sober part of the nation, it struck them with a kind of horror, to see themselves invited, by the authority of the king and church, to that which looked so like a contradiction to the command of God. It

* Book 11. p. 111.

was certainly out of character for bishops and clergymen, who should be the supports of religion, to draw men off from exercises of devotion in their families and closets, by enticing them to public recreations. People are forward enough of themselves to indulge these liberties, and need a check rather than a spur; but the wisdom of these times was different. The court had their balls, masquerades, and plays, on the Sunday evenings, while the youth of the country were at their morrice-dances, may-games, church and clerk ales, and all such kinds of revelling.*

The revival of this declaration was charged upon archbishop Laud at his trial, but his grace would not admit the charge, though he confessed his judgment was in favour of it. It was to be published in all parish-churches, either by the minister or any other person, at the discretion of the bishop, and therefore the putting this hardship on the clergy was their act and deed; but Laud knew it would distress the Puritans, and purge the church of a set of men, for whom he had a perfect aversion. The reason given for obliging them to this service was, because the two judges had enjoined the ministers to read their order against revels in the churches; and therefore it was proper to have it reversed by the same persons and in the same place.†

The severe pressing this declaration made sad havoc among the Puritans for seven years. Many poor clergymen strained their consciences in submission to their superiors. Some after publishing it, immediately read the fourth commandment to the people, "Remember the sabbath-day to keep it holy;" adding, "This is the law of God; the other the injunction of man." Some put it upon their curates, whilst great numbers refused to comply upon any terms whatsoever. Fuller‡ says, "that the archbishop's moderation in his own diocess was remarkable, silencing but three, in whom also was a concurrence of other nonconformities; but that his adversaries imputed it not to his charity but policy, fox-like, preying farthest from his own den, and instigating other bishops to do more than he would appear in himself." Sir Nath. Brent, his grace's vicar-general, attested upon oath at the archbishop's trial, that he gave him a special charge to convene all ministers before him who

* Dr. Warner adopts these remarks. Ed.
† Fuller's Church History, b. 11. p. 146. ‡ Ibid.

would not read the book of sports on the Lord's day, and to suspend them for it; and that he gave particular order to suspend the three following Kentish ministers by name, viz. Mr. Player, Mr. Hieron, and Mr. Culmer.* Whereupon he did, against his judgment, suspend them all *ab officio et beneficio*, though the king's declaration, as has been observed, does not oblige the minister to read it, nor authorize the bishops to inflict any punishment on the refusers. When the suspended ministers repaired to Lambeth, and petitioned to be restored, the archbishop told them, if they did know how to obey, he did not know how to grant their petition. So their suspension continued till the beginning of the commotions in Scotland, to the ruin of their poor families; Mr. Culmer having a wife and seven children to provide for.†

Several clergymen of other dioceses were also silenced, and deprived on the same account; as, Mr. Thomas Wilson of Otham, who being sent for to Lambeth, and asked whether he had read the book of sports in his church, answered No; whereupon the archbishop replied immediately, "I suspend you for ever from your office and benefice till you read it;" and so he continued four years, being cited into the high-commission, and articled against for the same crime. Mr. Wrath and Mr. Erbery were brought up from Wales, Mr. William Jones from Gloucestershire, with divers others, and censured by the high-commission (of which the archbishop was chief) for not reading the declaration, and not bowing his body at the blessed name of Jesus, &c.‡ To these may be added, Mr. Whitfield of Ockley, Mr. Garth of Woverah, Mr. Ward of Pepper-Harrow, Mr. Farrol of Purbright, and Mr. Pegges of Wexford, to whom the archbishop said, that he suspended him *ex nunc prout ex tunc*, in

* Prynne's Cant. Doom. p. 149.

† Dr. Grey introduces here a long quotation from Anthony Wood, and refers to a bad character of Mr. Culmer drawn by Mr. Lewis in Dr. Calamy's continuation of ejected ministers, to show what small reason Mr Neal had to defend him. It should seem, from those authorities, that he was a man of a warm and violent temper, and some heavy charges are brought against him. But not to say that prejudice appears to have drawn his picture, admitting the truth of every thing alleged against him, it is irrelevant to the vindication of archbishop Laud, whose severity against Mr. Culmer had not for its object his general deportment, or any immorality, but his not reading the book of sports; i. e. a royal invitation to men to give themselves up to disputing, riotous, and intemperate diversions on a day sacred to sobriety. See on Mr. Culmer's character, Palmer's Nonconformist's Memorial, vol. 3. p. 97.—Ed.

‡ Prynne's Cant. Doom. p. 151.

case he did not read the king's declaration for sports, on the Sunday se'nnight following.

The reverend and learned Mr. Lawrence Snelling, rector of Paul's-Cray, was not only suspended by the high-commission at Lambeth for four years, but deprived and excommunicated, for not reading the declaration, &c.* He pleaded in his own defence the laws of God and of the realm, and the authority of councils and fathers; he added, that the king's declaration did not enjoin ministers to read it, nor authorize the bishops or high-commissioners to suspend or punish ministers for not reading it; that it being merely a civil, not an ecclesiastical declaration enjoined by any canons or authority of the church, no ecclesiastical court could take cognizance of it. All which Mr. Snelling offered to the commissioners in writing, but the archbishop would not admit it, saying, in open court, that "whosoever should make such a defence, it should be burnt before his face, and he laid by the heels." Upon this he was personally and judicially admonished to read the declaration within three weeks, which he refusing, was suspended *ab officio et beneficio*. About four months after he was judicially admonished again, and refusing to comply, was excommunicated, and told, that unless he conformed before the second day of next term, he should be deprived; which was accordingly done, and he continued under the sentence many years, to his unspeakable damage.

"It were endless to go into more particulars; how many hundred godly ministers in this and other dioceses (says Mr. Prynne†) have been suspended from their ministry, sequestered, driven from their livings, excommunicated, prosecuted in the high-commission, and forced to leave the kingdom for not publishing this declaration, is experimentally known to all men." Dr. Wren, bishop of Norwich, says, that great numbers in his diocess had declined it, and were suspended; that some had since complied, but that

* Dr. Grey, to impeach the fairness of Mr. Neal, quotes here Rushworth, to shew that *sentence was passed on* Mr. Snelling for omitting to "read the litany and wear the surplice, and for not bowing, or making any corporal obeisance at hearing or reading the name of Jesus." It is true, that on these premises also the sentence of deprivation was passed; but it appears from Rushworth, that he had been previously suspended *ab officio et beneficio*, and excommunicated, solely *on the ground of* refusing to read the book of sports; and that this offence was the primary cause of the deprivation. Rushworth's Collections, vol. 2. part 2. p. 160, 161.—Ed.

† Cant. Doom. p. 155.

still there were thirty who peremptorily refused and were excommunicated. This the bishop thinks a small number, although if there were as many in other dioceses, the whole would amount to near eight hundred.

To render the Common Prayer-book more unexceptionable to the Papists, and more distant from Puritanism, the archbishop made sundry alterations* in the later editions, without the sanction of convocation or parliament. In the collect for the royal family, the princess Elizabeth and her children were left out, and these words were expunged, "O God, who art the Father of thine elect, and of their seed;" as tending towards particular election or predestination.† In the prayer for the 5th of November were these words, "Root out that antichristian and Babylonish sect which say of Jerusalem, Down with it even to the ground. Cut off those workers of iniquity, whose religion is rebellion, whose faith is faction, whose practice is murdering both soul and body;" which in the last edition are thus changed, "Root out the antichristian and Babylonish sect of them, which say of Jerusalem, Down with it.——Cut off those workers of iniquity, who turn religion into rebellion," &c. The design of which alteration was to relieve the Papists, and to turn the prayer against the Puritans, upon whom the Popish plot was to have been fathered. In the epistle for Palm-Sunday, instead of "*in* the name of Jesus," as it was heretofore, it is now according to the last translation, "*at* the name of Jesus every knee shall bow." But it was certainly very high presumption, for a single clergyman, or any number of them, to alter a service-book established by act of parliament, and impose those alterations upon the whole body of the clergy.

The Puritans always excepted against bowing at the name of Jesus; it appeared to them very superstitious, as if worship was to be paid to a name, or to the name of Jesus, more than to that of Christ or Immanuel. Nevertheless it was enjoined by the eighteenth canon, and in compliance with that injunction, our last translators inserted it into their text, by rendering ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, "in the name of Jesus," as it is before both in the Bible and Common Prayer-book, "at the name of Jesus," as it now stands;

* Dr. Grey says, that the archbishop fully cleared himself in this particular, by informing us [Troubles and Trial, p. 357], "that the alterations were made either by the king himself, or some other about him, when he was not at court."—Ed.

† Cant. Doom p. 111, 112.

however, no penalty was annexed to the neglect of this ceremony, nor did any suffer for it, till bishop Laud was at the head of the church, who pressed it equally with the rest, and caused above twenty ministers to be fined, censured, and put by their livings, for not bowing at the name of Jesus, or for preaching against it.*

On the 3d of November was debated, before his majesty in council, the question about removing the communion-table in St. Gregory's church near St. Paul's, from the middle of the chancel to the upper end of it, and placing it there in form of an altar. This being enjoined upon the churchwardens by the dean and chapter of St. Paul's, without the consent of the parishioners, they opposed it, and appealed to the court of arches, alleging that the book of Common-Prayer, and eighty-second canon, gave liberty to place the communion-table where it might stand with most convenience. His majesty being informed of the appeal, and acquainted by the archbishop, that it would be a leading case all over England, was pleased to order it to be debated before himself in council, and after hearing the arguments on both sides, declared that the liberty given by the eighty-second canon was not to be understood so, as if it were to be left to the discretion of the parish, much less to the fancies of a few humorous persons, but to the judgment of the ordinary [or bishop], to whose place it properly belonged to determine these points; he therefore confirmed the act of the ordinary, and gave commandment, that if the parishioners went on with their appeal, the dean of the arches, who was then attending at the hearing of the cause, should confirm the order of the dean and chapter.† This was a sovereign manner of putting an end to a controversy, very agreeable to the archbishop.

When the sacrament was administered in parish-churches the communion-table was usually placed in the middle of the chancel, and the people received round it, or in their several places thereabouts; but now all communion-tables were ordered to be fixed under the east wall of the chancel with the ends north and south in form of an altar; they were to be raised two or three steps above the floor, and encompassed with rails. Archbishop Laud ordered his vicar-general to see this alteration made in all the churches

* Usurpation of Prelates, p. 105. † Rushworth, vol. 2, part 2, p. 207.

and chapels of his province; to accomplish which, it was necessary to take down the galleries in some churches, and to remove ancient monuments. This was resented by some considerable families, and complained of as an injury to the dead, and such an expense to the living, as some country parishes could not bear; yet those who refused to pay the rates imposed by the archbishop for this purpose, were fined in the spiritual courts contrary to law.* It is almost incredible, what a ferment the making this alteration at once, raised among the common people all over England. Many ministers and churchwardens were excommunicated, fined, and obliged to do penance, for neglecting the bishop's injunctions. Great numbers refused to come up to the rails and receive the sacrament, for which some were fined, and others excommunicated, to the number of some hundreds, say the committee of the house of commons at the archbishop's trial.

Books were written for and against this new practice, with the same earnestness and contention for victory, as if the life of religion had been at stake. Dr. Williams, bishop of Lincoln, published two treatises against it, one entitled, "A letter to the vicar of Grantham;" the other, "The holy table, name, and thing;" filled with so much learning, and that learning so closely and solidly applied, says lord Clarendon, as shewed he had spent his time in his retirement with his books very profitably. Dr. Heylin, who answered the bishop, argued from the words of queen Elizabeth's injunctions, 1559; from the orders and advertisements of 1562 and 1565; from the practice of the king's chapels and cathedrals; and finally, from the present king's declaration, recommending a conformity of the parish-churches to their cathedrals. The bishop, and with him all the Puritans, insisted upon the practice of primitive antiquity, and upon the eighty-second canon of 1603, which says, "We appoint, that the table for the celebration of the holy communion shall be covered with a fair linen cloth at the time of administration, and shall then be placed in so good sort within the church or chancel, as thereby the minister may more conveniently be heard of the communicants in his prayer, and the communicants may more conveniently and in more numbers communicate." They urged the rubric in the Com-

* Prynne's Cant. Doom. p. 100, 101.

mon Prayer-book; that altars in churches were a Popish invention, of no greater antiquity in the Christian church than the sacrifice of the mass; and insisted strenuously on the discontinuance of them since the Reformation. But the archbishop, being determined to carry his point, prosecuted the affair with unjustifiable rigour over all the kingdom, punishing those who opposed him, without regard to the laws of the land. This occasioned a sort of schism among the bishops, and a great deal of uncharitableness among the inferior clergy; for those bishops who had not been beholden to Laud for their preferments, nor had any farther expectations, were very cool in the affair, while the archbishop's creatures, in many places, took upon them to make these alterations by their own authority, without the injunctions or directions of their diocesans, which laid the foundation of many lawsuits. Those who opposed the alterations were called Doctrinal Puritans, and the promoters of them Doctrinal Papists.

The court-clergy were of the latter sort, and were vehemently suspected of an inclination to Popery, because of their superstitious bowing to the altar, not only in time of divine service, but at their going in and out of church. This was a practice unknown to the laity of the church of England before this time, but archbishop Laud introduced it into the royal chapel at Whitehall, and recommended it to all the clergy by his example; for when he went in and out of chapel, a lane was always made for him to see the altar, and do reverence towards it. All his majesty's chaplains, and even the common people, were enjoined the same practice. In the new body of statutes for the cathedral of Canterbury, drawn up by his grace, and confirmed under the great-seal, the dean and prebendaries are obliged by oath, to bow to the altar at coming in and going out of the church; which could arise from no principle but a belief of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament or altar; or from a superstitious imitation of the Pagans worshipping towards the east.*

To make the adoration more significant, the altars in cathedrals were adorned with the most pompous furniture, and all the vessels underwent a solemn consecration. The cathedral of Canterbury was furnished, according to bishop

* Collyer's Eccles. Hist. p. 707

Andrew's model, who took it from the Roman missal, with two candlesticks and tapers, a basin for oblations, a cushion for the service-book, a silver gilt canister for the wafers, like a wicker-basket lined with cambric lace, the tonne on a cradle; a chalice with the image of Christ and the lost sheep, and of the wise men and star, engraven on the sides and on the cover. The chalice was covered with a linen napkin, called the aire, embroidered with coloured silk; two patins, the tricanale being a round ball with a screw cover, out of which issued three pipes, for the water of mixture; a credentia or side-table, with a basin and ewer on napkins, and a towel to wash before the consecration; three kneeling stools covered and stuffed, the foot-pace with three ascents, covered with a turkey carpet; three chairs used at ordinations, and the septum or rail with two ascents. Upon some altars there was a pot called the incense-pot, and a knife to cut the sacramental bread.

The consecration of this furniture was after this manner; the archbishop in his cope, attended by two chaplains in their surplices, having bowed several times towards the altar, read a portion of Scripture; then the vessels to be consecrated were delivered into the hands of the archbishop, who, after he had placed them upon the altar, read a form of prayer, desiring God to bless and accept of these vessels, which he severally touched and elevated, offering them up to God, after which they were not to be put to common use. We have seen already the manner of his grace's consecrating the sacramental elements at Creed-church; there was a little more ceremony in cathedrals, where the wafers and wine, being first placed with great solemnity on the credentia or side-table, were to be removed from thence by one of the archbishop's chaplains, who, as soon as he turns about his face to the altar with the elements in his hands, bows three times, and again, when he comes to the foot of it, where he presents them upon his knees, and lays them upon the altar for consecration. How far the bringing these inventions of men into the worship of God, is chargeable with superstition, and with a departing from the simplicity of the Christian institution, I leave with the reader; but surely the imposing them upon others under severe penalties, without the sanction of convocation, parliament, or royal mandate, was not to be justified.

The lecturers or afternoon preachers, giving his grace some disturbance, notwithstanding the attempts already made to suppress them, the king sent the following injunctions to the bishops of his province:* 1. "That they ordain no clergyman without a presentation to some living. Or, 2. Without a certificate that he is provided of some void church. Or, 3. Without some place in a cathedral or collegiate church. Or, 4. Unless he be a fellow of some college. Or, 5. A master of arts of five years' standing, living at his own charge. Or, 6. Without the intention of the bishop to provide for him."† By virtue of these injunctions no chaplainship to a nobleman's family, or any invitation to a lecture, could qualify a person for ordination without a living.

In the annual account the archbishop gave the king of the state of his province this year, we may observe how much the suppressing of these popular preachers lay upon his mind. "The bishop of Bath and Wells (says his grace) has taken a great deal of pains in his late visitation, to have all the king's instructions observed, and particularly he has put down several lecturers in market-towns, who were beneficed in other dioceses, because he found, when they had preached factious sermons, they retired without the reach of his jurisdiction.

"And whereas his majesty's instructions require, that lecturers should turn their afternoon sermons into catechisings, some parsons or vicars object against their being included, because lecturers are only mentioned; but the bishops will take care to clear their doubts, and settle their practice.

"The bishop of Peterborough‡ had suppressed a seditious lecture at Repon, and put down several monthly lectures

* Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 214.

† Dr. Grey truly observes, that none of these injunctions were new; but only an enforcement of the thirty-third canon of 1603. He refers the reader to bishop Gibson's Codex, p. 152, and might have referred to his own work, entitled, "A system of English ecclesiastical law," extracted from the Codex, p. 43, 44. But though these injunctions were not formed for the occasion, the application of them at that time was particularly directed against the lecturers, who are pointed at, in the king's letter which accompanied the injunctions, as persons "wandering up and down to the scandal of their calling, and to get a quaint name falling upon such courses as were most unfit for them, both by humoring their auditors, and otherways altogether unanswerable." It is easy to perceive what dictated this representation. "By reason of these strict rules (says Rushworth), no lecture whatsoever was admitted to be a canonical title."—Ed.

‡ It should be of Litchfield and Coventry, says Dr. Grey, from Laud's Trials and Troubles, p. 527. Ed.

kept with a fast, and managed by a moderator. He had also suppressed a meeting called the running lecture, because the lecture went from village to village.

"The bishop of St. Asaph says, that his diocess is, without exception, abating the increase of Romish recusants in some places, by their superstitious concourse to St. Winifred's well.

"The bishop of Landaff certifies, that he has not one stubborn Nonconformist, or schismatical minister, within his diocess, and but two lecturers.

"All the bishops declare, that they take special care of that branch of his majesty's instructions relating to Calvinism, or preaching upon the predestinarian points; and the archbishop prays his majesty, that no layman whatsoever, and least of all the companies of the city of London, or corporations, should under any pretence have power to put in, or turn out, any lecturer, or other minister."

In this account the reader will observe very little complaint of the growth of Popery, which we shall see presently was at a prodigious height; but all the archbishop's artillery is pointed against the Puritan clergy, who were the most determined and resolved Protestants in the nation.

Towards the close of this year came on the famous trial of William Prynne, esq. barrister at law, and member of Lincoln's inn, for his Histriomastix,* a book written against

* This book is a thick quarto, containing one thousand and six pages. It abounded with learning, and had some curious quotations, but it was a very tedious and heavy performance; so that it was not calculated to invite many to read it. This circumstance exposes the weakness, as the severity of the sentence against him does the wickedness, of those who pursued the author with such barbarity. He was a man of quiet and austere principles, of great reading, and most assiduous application to study. It was supposed, that, from the time of his arrival at man's estate, he wrote a sheet for every day of his life. "His custom (Mr. Wood informs us) was, when he studied, to put on a long quilted cap, which came an inch over his eyes, serving as an umbrella to defend them from too much light; and seldom eating a dinner, would every three hours or more be munching a roll of bread, and now and then refresh his exhausted spirits with ale." To this Butler seems to allude in his address to his muse:

Thou that with ale or viler liquors,
Didst inspire Withers, Prynne, and Vicars;
And teach them, though it were in spite
Of nature and their stars, to write.

His works amounted to forty volumes folio and quarto. The most valuable, and a very useful performance, is his "Collection of Records" in four large volumes. Ussher's Life of Charles I. p. 226, 227. Wood's Athenæ Oxon. vol. 2. p. 315; and Granger's Biog. Hist. vol. 2. p. 230, 8vo. The prosecution of Mr. Prynne originated with archbishop Laud, who on a Sunday morning went to Noy, the attorney-general, with the charges against him. Prynne had instigated the resentment of Laud and other prelates by his writing against Arminianism and the jurisdiction of the bishops, and by some prohibitions he had moved and got in the high-commission court.—"Fantome animis cœlestibus iræ." Whitelocke's Memoirs, p. 18.—Ed.

plays, masks, dancing, &c. The information sets forth, that though the author knew that the queen and lords of the council were frequently present at these diversions, yet he had railed against these and several others, as may-poles, Christmas-keeping, dressing houses with ivy, festivals, &c. that he had aspersed the queen, and commended factious persons; which things are of dangerous consequence to the realm and state.* The cause was heard in the star-chamber, February 7, 1633. The counsel for Mr. Prynne were, Mr. Atkyns, afterward a judge of the common-pleas, Mr. Jenkins, Holbourne, Herne, and Lightfoot. For the king was Mr. attorney-general Noy. The counsel for the defendant pleaded, that he had handled the argument of stage-plays in a learned manner, without designing to reflect on his superiors;† that the book had been licensed according to law; and that if any passages may be construed to reflect on his majesty, or any branch of his government, he humbly begs pardon. But Mr. Attorney aggravated the charge in very severe language, and pronounced it a malicious and dangerous libel. After a full hearing he was sentenced to have his book burnt by the hands of the common hangman, to be put from the bar, and to be for ever incapable of his profession, to be turned out of the society of Lincoln's inn, to be degraded at Oxford, to stand in the pillory at Westminster and Cheapside, to lose both his ears, one in each place, to pay a fine of 5,000*l.* and to suffer perpetual imprisonment. Remarkable was the speech of the earl of Dorset on this occasion: "Mr. Prynne (says he), I declare you to be a schism-maker in the church, a sedition-sower in the commonwealth, a wolf in sheep's clothing; in a word, *omnium malorum nequissimus*. I shall fine him 10,000*l.* which is more than he is worth, yet less than he deserves. I will not set him at liberty, no more than a plagued man or a mad dog, who though he can't bite will foam: he is so far from being a social soul, that he is not a rational soul. He is fit

* Rushworth, vol. 2, part 2. p. 221.

† A passage quoted by Dr. Gray from lord Cottington's speech, at the trial of Mr. Prynne, will afford a specimen of the spirit and style of the Histriomastix: "Our English ladies (he writes), shorn and frizzled madams, have lost their modesty; that the devil is only honoured in dancing; that they that frequent plays are damned; and so are all that do not concur with him, in his opinion, whores, pandors, foul incarnate devils, Judases to their Lord and Master." But this way of speaking was in the taste of the times; and the speech of lord Dorset, given above, shows that a nobleman did not come behind him in severe and foul language.—*Etc.*

to live in dens with such beasts of prey, as wolves and tigers, like himself; therefore I condemn him to perpetual imprisonment; and for corporal punishment I would have him branded in the forehead, slit in the nose, and have his ears chopped off."* A speech more fit for an American savage than an English nobleman!

A few months after, Dr. Bastwick, a physician at Colchester, having published a book entitled "Elenchus religionis Papisticæ," with an appendix called "Flagellum pontificis et episcoporum Latialium," which gave offence to the English bishops, because it denied the divine right of the order of bishops above presbyters, was cited before the high-commission, who discarded him from his profession [1634], excommunicated him, fined him 1,000*l.* and imprisoned him till he recanted.†

Mr. Burton, B. D. minister of Friday-street, having published two exceptionable sermons, from Prov. xxiv. 21, 22, entitled, "For God and the king," against the late innovations, had his house and study broken open by a serjeant at arms, and himself committed close prisoner to the Gatehouse, where he was confined several years.

These terrible proceedings‡ of the commissioners made many conscientious Nonconformists retire with their families to Holland and New England, for fear of falling into the hands of men, whose tender mercies were cruelty.

Among others who went over this year, was the reverend and learned Mr. John Cotton, B. D. fellow of Emanuel-college, Cambridge, and minister of Boston in Lincolnshire, where he was in such repute, that Dr. Preston and others from Cambridge frequently visited him; he was an admired preacher, and of a most meek and gentle disposition; he became a Nonconformist upon this principle, That

* Rushworth, vol. 2. part. 2. p. 233. 240.

† Dr. Grey's remark here, as doing credit to himself, deserves to be quoted: "The severity of the sentence (says the doctor) I am far from justifying."—Ed.

‡ "The punishment of these men, who were of the three great professions (says Mr. Granger) was ignominious and severe: though they were never objects of esteem, they soon became objects of pity. The indignity and severity of their punishment gave general offence; and they were no longer regarded as criminals, but confessors." While these prosecutions were carried on with unrelenting severity, Chowney, a fierce Papist, who wrote a book in defence of the Popish religion, and of the church of Rome, avowing it to be the true church, was not only not punished, or even questioned for his performance; but was permitted to dedicate it to the archbishop, and it was favoured with his patronage. Granger's Biogr. Hist. vol. 2. p. 192; and Whitelocke's Memoirs, p. 211.—Ed.

no church had power to impose indifferent ceremonies, not commanded by Christ, on the consciences of men.* He therefore omitted some of the ceremonies, and administered the sacrament to such as desired it without kneeling; for which he was informed against in the high-commission; and Laud being now at the head of affairs, the bishop of Lincoln his diocesan could not protect him. Mr. Cotton applied to the earl of Dorset for his interest with the archbishop, but the earl sent him word, that "if he had been guilty of drunkenness, uncleanness, or any such lesser fault, he could have got his pardon, but the sin of Puritanism and nonconformity (says his lordship) is unpardonable, and therefore you must fly for your safety." Upon this he travelled to London in disguise, and took passage for New England, where he arrived September 3, 1633, and spent the remainder of his days, to the year 1652.

Mr. John Davenport, B. D. and vicar of Coleman-street, London, resigned his living, and retired to Holland this summer, 1633.† He had fallen under the resentments of his diocesan bishop Laud, for being concerned in the feoffments, which, together with some notices he received of being prosecuted for nonconformity, induced him to embark for Amsterdam, where he continued about three years, and then returning to England, he shipped himself with some other families for New England, where he began the settlement of Newhaven in the year 1637. He was a good scholar, and an admired preacher, but underwent great hardships in the infant colony, with whom he continued till about the year 1670, when he died.

The reverend Mr. Thomas Hooker, fellow of Emanuel-college, Cambridge, and lecturer of Chelmsford in Essex, after four years' exercise of his ministry, was obliged to lay it down for nonconformity, though forty-seven conformable ministers in the neighbourhood subscribed a petition to the bishop [Laud], in which they declare, that Mr. Hooker was, for doctrine orthodox, for life and conversation honest, for disposition peaceable, and in no wise turbulent or factious.‡ Notwithstanding which he was silenced by the spiritual court, 1630, and bound in a recognizance of 50*l.* to appear before the high-commission; but by the advice of his friends,

* Mather's Hist. N. E. b. 3. p. 18, &c. † Ibid. b. 3. p. 52.
‡ Ibid. p. 60.

he forfeited his recognizance and fled to Holland; here he continued about two years fellow-labourer with old Mr. Forbes a Scotsman at Delft, from whence he was called to assist Dr. Ames at Rotterdam, upon whose death he returned to England, and being pursued by the bishop's officers from place to place, he embarked this summer for New England, and settled with his friends upon the banks of Connecticut-river, where he died in the year 1647. He was an awakening preacher, and a considerable practical writer, as appears by his books of Preparation for Christ, Contrition, Humiliation, &c.

The reverend and learned Dr. William Ames, educated at Cambridge, under the famous Mr. Perkins, fled from the persecution of archbishop Bancroft, and became minister of the English church at the Hague, from whence he was invited by the states of Friesland to the divinity-chair in the university of Franeker, which he filled with universal reputation for twelve years. He was in the synod of Dort, and informed king James's ambassador at the Hague, from time to time, of the debates of that venerable assembly. He wrote several treatises in Latin against the Arminians, which, for their conciseness and perspicuity, were not equalled by any of his time. His other works are, Manuductio Logica, Medulla Theologiæ, Cases of Conscience, Analysis on the book of Psalms, Notes on the First and Second Epistles of Peter, and upon the Catechistical Heads. After twelve years Dr. Ames resigned his professorship, and accepted of an invitation to the English congregation at Rotterdam, the air of Franeker being too sharp for him, he being troubled with such a difficulty of breathing, that he concluded every winter would be his last; besides, he had a desire to be employed in the delightful work of preaching to his own countrymen, which he had disused for many years. Upon his removal to Rotterdam he wrote his "Fresh suit against ceremonies;" but his constitution was so shattered, that the air of Holland did him no service; upon which he determined to remove to New England, but his asthma returning at the beginning of the winter before he sailed, put an end to his life at Rotterdam, where he was buried November 14, N.S. 1633. Next spring his wife and children embarked for New England, and carried with them his valuable library of books, which was a rich treasure to the country at that

time. The doctor was a very learned divine, a strict Calvinist in doctrine, and of the persuasion of the Independents, with regard to the subordination and power of classes and synods.*

Archbishop Laud being now chancellor of the university of Dublin, and having a new vice-chancellor [Wentworth] disposed to serve the purposes of the prerogative, turned his thoughts against the Calvinists of that kingdom, resolving to bring the church of Ireland to adopt the articles of the church of England. Archbishop Usher, and some of his brethren, being informed of the design, moved in convocation, that their own articles, ratified by king James in the year 1615, might be confirmed; but the motion was rejected, because it was said, they were already fortified with all the authority the church could give them, and that a farther confirmation would imply a defect. It was then moved on the other side, that for silencing the Popish objections of a disagreement among Protestants, a canon should be passed for approving the articles of the church of England, which was done only with one dissenting voice; one Calvinist, says Mr. Collyer, having looked deeper into the matter than the rest.

The canon was in these words: "For the manifestation of our agreement with the church of England, in the confession of the same Christian faith and doctrine of the sacrament, we do receive and approve the book of articles of religion, agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops, &c. in the year 1562, for the avoiding diversity of opinions, and for establishing consent touching true religion; and therefore if any hereafter shall affirm, that any of these articles are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated."†

The Irish bishops thought they had lost nothing by this canon, because they had saved their own articles, but Laud took advantage of it during the time of his chancellorship;

* He filled the divinity-chair with admirable abilities. His fame was so great, that many came from remote nations to be educated under him. In "An historical and critical account of Hugh Peters," London, 1751, is a quotation from a piece of his in these words: "I commend Ames in breathed his last breath into my bosom, who left his professorship in Friesland to live with me, because of my church's independency at Rotterdam. He was my colleague, and I chosen brother to the church, while I was an unworthy pastor." Granger's History of England, vol. 2 p. 194, 195. 8vo.—Ed.

† Bib. Reg. § 13. no. 11.

for hereby the church of Ireland denounced the sentence of excommunication against all that affirmed any of the thirty-nine articles to be superstitious or erroneous, that is, against the whole body of the Puritans; and Fuller* adds, that their own articles, which condemned Arminianism, and maintained the morality of the sabbath, were utterly excluded.

This summer the reverend Mr. Thomas Sheppard, M. A. fled to New England. He had been lecturer at Earl's-Coln in Essex several years, but when Laud became bishop of London his lecture was put down, and himself silenced; he then retired into the family of a private gentleman, but the bishop's officers following him thither, he travelled into Yorkshire, where Neile archbishop of that province commanded him to subscribe or depart the country; upon this he went to Hedon in Northumberland, where his labours were prospered to the conversion of some souls; but the bishop of Durham, by the direction of archbishop Laud, forbade his preaching in any part of his diocess, which obliged him to take shipping at Yarmouth for New England; where he continued pastor of the church at Cambridge till his death, which happened August 25, 1649, in the forty-fourth year of his age.† He was a hard student, an exemplary Christian, and an eminent practical writer, as appears by his Sincere Convert, and other practical works that go under his name.

The reverend Mr. John Norton went over in the same ship with Mr. Sheppard,‡ being driven out of Hertfordshire by the severity of the times. He settled at Ipswich in New England, and was afterward removed to Boston, where he died in the year 1665. Mr. Fuller says, he was a divine of no less learning than modesty, as appears sufficiently by his numerous writings.

His grace of Canterbury, having made some powerful efforts to bring the churches of Scotland and Ireland to a uniformity with England, resolved in his metropolitical visitation this summer, to reduce the Dutch and French churches (which were ten in number, having between five and six thousand communicants) to the same conformity; for this purpose he tendered them these three articles of inquiry.

1. "Whether do you use the Dutch or French liturgy?

* Church Hist. b. 11. p. 149.

† Mather's Hist. New England, b. 3. p. 90, &c. ‡ Ib. p. 84

2. "Of how many descents are you since you came into England?

3. "Do such as are born here in England conform to the English ceremonies?"

The ministers and elders demurred upon these questions, and insisted upon their charter of privileges granted by king Edward VI. and confirmed no less than five times in the reign of king James, and twice by king Charles himself, by virtue of which they had been exempt from all archiepiscopal and episcopal jurisdiction till this time: yet Laud, without any regard to their charter, sent them the two following injunctions by his vicar-general.

1. "That all that were born in England of the Dutch and Walloon congregations, should repair to their parish-churches.

2. "That those who were not natives, but came from abroad, while they remained strangers, might use their own discipline as formerly."

In this emergency the Dutch and Walloon churches petitioned for a toleration, and shewed the inconveniences that would arise from the archbishop's injunctions; as, that if all their children born in England were taken from their communion, their churches must break up and return home; for as they came into England for the liberty of their consciences, they would not continue here after it was taken from them.* They desired therefore it might be considered what damages would arise to the kingdom by driving away the foreigners with their manufactures, and discouraging others from settling in their room. The mayor and corporation of Canterbury assured his grace, that above twelve hundred of their poor were maintained by the foreigners, and others interceded with the king in their favour; but his majesty answered, "We must believe our archbishop of Canterbury," who used their deputies very roughly, calling them a nest of schismatics, and telling them it were better to have no foreign churches, than to indulge their nonconformity. In conclusion he assured them, by a letter dated August 19, 1635, that his majesty was resolved his injunctions should be observed, viz. That all their children of the second

* It is said that Richelieu made the following speech on this enacted conformity: "If a king of England, who is a Protestant, will not permit two disciplines in his kingdom, why should a king of France, who is a Papist, admit two religions" Mrs. Macaulay's History of England, vol. 2. p. 114, note. 8vo.—Ed.

descent born in England, should resort to their parish-churches,* "and (says his grace) I do expect all obedience and conformity from you, and if you refuse, I shall proceed against the natives according to the laws and canons ecclesiastical." Accordingly some of their churches were interdicted, others shut up, and the assemblies dissolved; their ministers being suspended, many of their people left the kingdom, especially in the diocess of Norwich, where bishop Wren drove away three thousand manufacturers in wool, cloth, &c. some of whom employed a hundred poor people at work; to the unspeakable damage of the kingdom.

As a further mark of disregard to the foreign Protestants, the king's ambassador in France was forbidden to frequent their religious assemblies. "It had been customary (says lord Clarendon) for the ambassadors employed in any parts where the reformed religion was exercised, to frequent their churches, and to hold correspondence with the most powerful persons of that religion, particularly the English ambassadors at Paris constantly frequented the church at Charenton; but the contrary to this was now practised, and some advertisements, if not instructions, given to the ambassador, to forbear any commerce with the men of that religion. Lord Scudamore, who was the last ambassador before the beginning of the long parliament, instead of going to Charenton, furnished his chapel after the new fashion, with candles upon the altar, &c. and took care to publish, upon all occasions, that the church of England looked not on the Hugonots as a part of their communion; which was likewise industriously discoursed at home. This made a great many foreign Protestants leave the kingdom, and transport themselves into foreign parts." The church of England by this means lost the esteem of the reformed churches abroad, who could hardly pity her, when a few years after she sunk down into the deepest distress.

To give another instance of the archbishop's disaffection to the foreign Protestants, the queen of Bohemia, the king's sister, solicited the king, in the most pressing manner, to admit of a public collection over England for the poor persecuted ministers of the Palatinate, who were banished their country for their religion. Accordingly the king granted them a brief to go through the kingdom; but when it was

* Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 275.

brought to the archbishop he excepted against the following clause:* "Whose cases are the more to be deplored, because this extremity is fallen upon them for their sincerity and constancy in the true religion, which we together with them professed, and which we are all bound in conscience to maintain to the utmost of our powers. Whereas these religious and godly persons, being involved among others their countrymen, might have enjoyed their estates and fortunes, if with other backsliders in the times of trial they would have submitted themselves to the antichristian yoke, and have renounced or dissembled the profession of their religion." His grace had two exceptions to this passage: 1. The religion of the Palatine churches is affirmed to be the same with ours, which he denied, because they were Calvinists, and because their ministers had not episcopal ordination. 2. He objected to the church of Rome's being called an antichristian yoke, because it would then follow, that she was in no capacity to convey sacerdotal power in ordinations, and consequently the benefit of the priesthood, and the force of holy ministrations, would be lost in the English church, forasmuch as she has no orders but what she derives from the church of Rome. Laud having acquainted the king with his exceptions, they were expunged in another draught. But the collection not succeeding in this way, Dr. Sibbes, Gouge, and other divines of the Puritan party, signed a private recommendatory letter, desiring their friends to enlarge their charity, as to men of the same faith and profession with themselves, and promising to see to the right distribution of the money; but as soon as Laud heard of it, he cited the divines before the high-commission, and put a stop to the collection.

This year [1634] put an end to the life of the reverend Mr. Hugh Clarke, born at Burton-upon-Trent 1563, and educated partly at Cambridge and partly at Oxford. He was first minister of Oundle in Northamptonshire, and then of Woolston in Warwickshire, from whence he was suspended, and afterward excommunicated, for expounding upon the catechism. At length he was indicted for high treason, because he had prayed, "that God would forgive the queen [Elizabeth] her sins,"† but was acquitted. He

* Cyp. Aug. Collyer, vol. 2. p. 764, 765.

† Here bishop Warburton censures Mr. Neal as guilty of "an unfair representation." His lordship adds, "that they were the sins of persecuting the holy discipline which he prayed for the remission of; and that, reflecting on her administration

was an awakening preacher, of a warm spirit, and a robust constitution, which he wore out with preaching twice every Lord's day, and frequently on the week-days. His ministry met with great success even to his death, which happened November 6, 1634, in the seventy-second year of his age.*

About the same time died the reverend and pious Mr. John Carter, a man that feared God from his youth, and was always employed in acts of devotion and charity. He was born in Kent 1554, and educated in Clare-hall, Cambridge. He was, first, minister of Bramford in Suffolk for thirty-four years, and then rector of Bedstead in the same county; and though often in trouble for his nonconformity, he made a shift, by the assistance of friends, to maintain his liberty without any sinful compliance. He was mighty in prayer, frequent and fervent in preaching, and a resolute champion against Popery, Arminianism, and the new ceremonies. He lived to a good old age, and died suddenly, as he was lying down to sleep, in the eighteenth year of his age, greatly lamented by all who had a taste for practical religion and undissembled piety.† His funeral sermon was preached before a vast concourse of people, from these words, "My father, my father, the chariots of Israel, and the horsemen thereof!"

Conformity to the new ceremonies and the king's injunctions was now pressed with the utmost rigour. The reverend Mr. Crook of Brazen-nose-college, and Mr. Hobbes of Trinity-college, Oxford, were enjoined a public recantation for reflecting upon the Arminians.

Mr. Samuel Ward, of Ipswich, having preached against the book of sports, and bowing at the name of Jesus, added, that the church of England was ready to ring changes in religion; and that the gospel stood a tiptoe, ready to be gone to America;‡ for which he was suspended, and en-

---

was the thing which gave offence." The bishop is certainly right in this construction of Mr. Clarke's prayer; but there is no occasion, methinks, for the charge he brings against Mr. Neal, who does not refer the expression, nor insinuate that it was to be referred, to the personal vices of the queen, but rather the contrary; for he speaks of it as the ground on which Mr. Clarke was indicted for high treason. He might well suppose, that his reader would understand the language as pointing to the oppressions of her government, and the severities which the Puritans suffered under it. This would have been perfectly clear, had Mr. Neal added from his author, that this prayer, though in modest expressions, was offered up, when the persecution of the Nonconformists was becoming hot.—Ed.

* Clarke's Lives annexed to his General Martyrology, p. 127

† Ut supra, p. 132.

‡ Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 280. Prynne, p. 280.

joined a public recantation. Another underwent the same censure, for saying, it was suspicious that the night was approaching, because the shadows were so much longer than the body, and ceremonies more enforced than the power of godliness.

The reverend Mr. Chauncey, late minister of Ware, but now of Marston-Lawrence, in the diocess of Peterborough, was imprisoned, condemned in costs of suit, and obliged to read the following recantation, for opposing the railing in the communion-table:

"Whereas I, Charles Chauncey, clerk, late vicar of Ware, stand convicted for opposing the setting up a rail round the communion-table, and for saying it was an innovation, a snare to men's consciences, a breach of the second commandment, an addition to God's worship, and that which drove me from the place, I do now, before this honourable court, acknowledge my great offence, and protest I am ready to declare upon oath, that I am now persuaded in my conscience, that kneeling at the communion is a lawful and commendable gesture; that the rail is a decent and convenient ornament, and that I was much to blame for opposing it; and do promise from henceforth, never by word or deed to oppose that, or any other laudable rites and ceremonies used in the church of England."*

After this he was judicially admonished and discharged; but the recantation went so much against his conscience, that he could enjoy no peace till he had quitted the church of England, and retired to New England, where he made an open acknowledgment of his sin.

The churchwardens of Beckington in Somersetshire were excommunicated by the bishop of Bath and Wells, for refusing to remove the communion-table from the middle of the chancel to the east end, and not pulling down the seats to make room for it. They produced a certificate, that their communion-table had stood time out of mind in the midst of the chancel; that the ground on which it was placed was raised a foot, and enclosed with a decent wainscot border, and that none went within it but the minister, and such as he required. This not availing, they appealed to the arches, and at last to the king; but their appeal was rejected. After they had remained excommunicated for a year, they

* Prynne, p. 95. 97. 100. Rushworth, vol. 2. part. 2. p. 301. 316.

were cast into the common jail, where they continued till the year 1637, and were then obliged to do public penance in the parish-church of Beckington, and two others, the shame of which broke their hearts; one of them declaring upon his death-bed soon after, that the penance and submission, so much against his conscience, had sunk his spirits, and was one principal cause of his death.*

In the archbishop's metropolitical visitation this summer, Mr. Lee, one of the prebendaries of Litchfield, was suspended, for churching refractory women in private, for being averse to the good orders of the church, and for ordering the bellman to give notice in open market of a sermon.† Mr. Randal, of Tuddington, near Hampton-court, Middlesex, was suspended for preaching a sermon above an hour long on Sunday in the afternoon, though it was a farewell sermon to the exercise of catechising. His grace's account of his province this year gives a farther relation of the sufferings of the Puritans:‡ he acquaints his majesty, that the French and Dutch churches had not as yet thoroughly complied with his injunctions.—That in the diocess of London, Dr. Houghton rector of Aldermanbury, Mr. Simpson curate and lecturer of St. Margaret, Fish-street, Mr. John Goodwin vicar of Coleman-street, and Mr. Viner of St. Lawrence Old-Jewry, had been convened for breach of canons, and had submitted; to whom his grace might have added, Dr. Sibbes, Dr. Taylor, Dr. Gouge, Mr. White of Dorsetshire, and about twenty more; some of whom fled into Holland, and others retired into New England. The bishop of Bath and Wells certified, that he had not one single lecture in any corporation-town, and that all afternoon sermons were turned into catechisings in all parishes.—In the diocess of Norwich were many Puritans, but that Mr. Ward of Yarmouth was in the high-commission. From the diocess of Llandaff, Mr. Wroth and Mr. Erbury, two noted schismatics, were brought before the high-commission.—And that in the diocess of Gloucester, were several popular and factious ministers.

It must be confessed, that the zeal of the Puritans was not always well regulated; nor were their ministers so much on their guard in the pulpit or conversation as they ought, considering the number of informers that entered all their

* Rushworth, vol. 2. part. 2. p. 300. † Prynne, p. 381.
‡ Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. 2. p. 765.

churches, that insinuated themselves into all public conversation, and, like so many locusts, covered the land. These were so numerous and corrupt, that the king was obliged to bring them under certain regulations; for no man was safe in public company, nor even in conversing with his friends and neighbours. Many broke up housekeeping, that they might breathe in a freer air; which the council being informed of, a proclamation was published [July 21, 1635], forbidding all persons, except soldiers, mariners, merchants, and their factors, to depart the kingdom without his majesty's licence.

But notwithstanding this prohibition, numbers went to New England this summer; and among others the reverend Mr. Peter Bulkley, B. D. and fellow of St. John's college, Cambridge. He was son of Dr. Edward Bulkley, of Bedfordshire, and succeeded him at Woodhill or Odel in that county. Here he continued above twenty years, the bishop of Lincoln conniving at his nonconformity: but when Dr. Laud was at the helm of the church, and the bishop of Lincoln in disgrace, Bulkley was silenced by the vicar-general sir Nathaniel Brent; upon which he sold a very plentiful estate, and transported himself and his effects to New England, where he died in the year 1658—9, and the seventy-seventh of his age. He was a thundering preacher, and a judicious divine, as appears by his treatise "Of the covenant," which passed through several editions, and was one of the first books published in that country.*

Mr. Richard Mather, educated in Brazen-nose-college, Oxon, and minister of Toxteth near Liverpool for about fifteen years, a diligent and successful preacher, was suspended for nonconformity in the year 1633, but by the intercession of friends, after six months he was restored. Next summer the archbishop of York sending his visitors into Lancashire, this good man was again suspended by Dr. Cosins, upon an information that he had not worn the surplice for fifteen years. After this, no intercession could obtain the liberty of his ministry; upon which he took shipping at Bristol, and arrived at Boston in New England, August 17, 1635. He settled at Dorchester, and continued with his people, a plain and profitable preacher to the year 1669,

* Rapin, vol. 2 p. 301, folio edit.

when he died. This was the grandfather of the famous Dr. Cotton Mather.

In Scotland the fire was kindling apace, which in three years' time set both kingdoms in a flame. The restoring episcopacy by the violent methods already mentioned, did not sit easy upon the people; the new Scots bishops were of bishop Laud's principles; they spoke very favourably of Popery in their sermons, and cast some invidious reflections on the reformers: they declared openly for the doctrines of Arminius; for sports on the sabbath; and for the liturgy of the English church; which was imagined to be little better than the mass.* This lost them their esteem with the people, who had been trained up in the doctrines and discipline of Calvin, and in the strict observation of the Lord's day. But the king, to support them, cherished them with expressions of the greatest respect and confidence; he made eleven of them privy-counsellors; the archbishop of St. Andrews was lord-chancellor, and the bishop of Ross was in nomination to be lord-high-treasurer; divers of them were of the exchequer, and had engrossed the best secular preferments, which made them the envy of the nobility and gentry of that nation. The bishops were so sensible of this, that they advised the king not to trust the intended alterations in religion to parliaments or general assemblies, but to introduce them by his regal authority.

When the king was last in Scotland, it was taken notice of as a great blemish in the kirk, that it had no liturgy or book of canons. To supply this defect the king gave orders to the new bishops, to prepare draughts of both, and remit them to London, to be revised by the bishops Laud, Juxon, and Wren. The book of canons being first finished, was presented to the king, and by him delivered to Laud and Juxon to examine, alter, and reform, at pleasure, and to bring it as near as possible to a conformity with the English canons. The bishops having executed their commission, and prepared it for the press, the king confirmed it under the great seal by letters patent, dated at Greenwich, May 23, 1635. The instrument sets forth, "that his majesty, by his royal and supreme authority in causes ecclesiastical, ratifies and confirms the said canons, orders, and constitu-

* Burnet's Memoirs of D. Hamilton, p. 29, 30.

tions, and all and every thing in them contained, and strictly commands all archbishops, bishops, and others exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to see them punctually observed."

To give the reader a specimen of these canons, which were subversive of the whole Scots constitution both in kirk and state:

1. "The first canon excommunicates all those who affirm the power and prerogative of the king not to be equal with the Jewish kings, that is, absolute and unlimited.

2. "The second excommunicates those who shall affirm, the worship contained in the Book of Common Prayer, [which was not yet published], or the government of the kirk, by archbishops, bishops, &c. to be corrupt, superstitious, or unlawful.

3. "The third restrains ordinations to the *quatuor tempora*; that is, the first weeks of March, June, September, and December.

5. "The fifth obliges all presbyters to read, or cause to be read, divine service, according to the form of the Book of the Scottish Common Prayer, and to conform to all the offices, parts, and rubrics, of it [though not yet published].

The book decrees farther, "that no assembly of the clergy shall be called but by the king.

"That none shall receive the sacrament but upon their knees.

"That every ecclesiastical person, dying without children, shall give part of his estate to the church.

"That the clergy shall have no private meetings for expounding Scripture.

"That no clegyman shall conceive prayer, but pray only by the printed form, to be prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer.

"That no man shall teach school without a licence from the bishop; nor any censures of the church be pronounced, but by the approbation of the bishop.

"That no presbyter shall reveal any thing in confession, except his own life should by the concealment be forfeited."

After sundry other canons of this nature, as appointing fonts for baptism, church-ornaments, communion-tables, or altars, &c. the book decrees, that no person shall be ad-

mitted to holy orders, or to preach or administer the sacraments, without first subscribing the forementioned canons.

This book was no sooner published, than the Scots presbyters declared peremptorily against it;* their objections were of two sorts; they disliked the matter of the canons, as inconsistent with their kirk-government, and severer in some particulars than those of the church of England: they protested also against the manner of imposing them, without consent of parliament or general assembly. It was thought intolerable vassalage, by a people who had asserted the independent power of the church, to convene assemblies of the clergy, and who had maintained that their decrees were binding, without the confirmation of the crown; to have the king and a few foreign bishops dictate canons to them, without so much as asking their advice and consent. Such a high display of the supremacy could not fail of being highly resented by a church, that had never yielded it to the king in the latitude in which it had been claimed and exercised in England. Besides, it was very preposterous to publish the book of canons before the book of common prayer, and to require submission and subscription to things that had no existence; for who could foretel what might be inserted in the common prayer-book? or what kind of service might be imposed upon the kirk? This looked too much like pinning the faith of a whole nation on the lawn-sleeves.

To return to England: Towards the end of this year it pleased God to remove out of this world the reverend Dr. Richard Sibbes, one of the most celebrated preachers of his time. He was born at Sudbury 1579, and educated in St. John's college, Cambridge, where he went through all the degrees. Having entered into the ministry, he was first chosen lecturer of Trinity-church in Cambridge, where his ministry was very successful to the conversion and reformation of his hearers. About the year 1618, he was appointed preacher to the honourable society of Gray's inn, London, in which station he became so famous, that besides the lawyers of the house, many of the nobility and gentry frequented his sermons. In the year 1625, he was chosen master of Katherine-hall in the university of Cambridge, the government of which he made a shift to continue to his

* Collyer's Eccles. Hist. p. 761.

death, though he was turned out of his fellowship and lecture in the university for nonconformity, and often cited before the high-commission. He was a divine of good learning, thoroughly acquainted with the Scriptures, a burning and shining light, and of a most humble charitable disposition; but all these talents could not screen him from the fury of the times. His works* discover him to have been of a heavenly evangelical spirit, the comforts of which he enjoyed at his death, which happened the latter end of this summer, in the fifty-ninth year of his age.†

To aggrandize the church yet farther, the archbishop resolved to bring part of the business of Westminster-hall into the ecclesiastical courts. The civilians had boldly and unwarrantably opposed and protested against prohibitions, and other proceedings at law, in restraint of their spiritual courts, and had procured some privileges and orders from the king in favour of the ecclesiastical courts, which had greatly offended the gentlemen of the law. But the archbishop now went a step farther, and prevailed with the king to direct that half the masters in chancery should always be civil lawyers; and to declare that no others, of what condition soever, should serve him as masters of request: these were more akin to the church than the common lawyers; their places being in the bishop's disposal, (as chancellors, commissaries, &c.) and therefore it was supposed their persons would be so too; but this was false policy, says the noble historian,‡ because it disgusted a whole learned profession, who were more capable of disserving the church in their estates, inheritances, and stewardships, than the church could hurt them in their practice. Besides, it was wrong in itself, for I have never yet spoken with one clergyman, says his lordship, who hath had experience of both litigations, that has not ingenuously confessed, that he had rather, in respect of his trouble, charge, and satisfaction to his understanding, have three suits depending in Westminster-hall, than one in the arches, or any ecclesiastical court.

* Of these the most noted was his Bruised Reed; to which, Mr. Baxter tells us, he in a great measure owed his conversion. This circumstance alone, observes Mr. Granger, would have rendered his name memorable. History of England, vol. 2 p. 176. 8vo. - Ed.

† Clarke's Lives, annexed to his General Martyrology, p. 145.

‡ Clarendon, vol. 2. p. 599, 606.

As a farther step towards the sovereign power of the church, his grace prevailed with the king to allow the bishops to hold their ecclesiastical courts in their own names, and by their own seals, without the king's letters patent under the great seal; the judges having given it as their opinion, that a patent under the great seal was not necessary for examinations, suspensions, and other church-censures. This was undoubtedly contrary to law, for by the statute 1 Edw. cap. 2, it is declared, "that all ecclesiastical jurisdiction is immediately from the crown; and that all persons exercising such jurisdiction shall have in their seal the king's arms, and shall use no other seal of jurisdiction on pain of imprisonment."* This statute being repealed 1 Mariæ, cap. 2, was again revived by 1 Jac. cap. 25, as has been observed.† Hereupon, in the parliaments of the 3d and 7th of king James I. the bishops were proceeded against, and two of them in a manner attainted in a premunire by the house of commons, for making citations and processes in their own names, and using their own seals, contrary to this statute, and to the common law, and in derogation of the prerogative. So that by this concession, the king dispensed with the laws, and yielded away the ancient and undoubted right of his crown; and the bishops were brought under a premunire, for exercising spiritual jurisdiction without any special commission, patent, or grant, from, by, or under, his majesty; whereas all jurisdiction of this kind ought to have been exercised in the king's name, and by virtue of *his* authority only, signified by letters patent under his majesty's seal.

The archbishop was no less intent upon enlarging his own jurisdiction, claiming a right to visit the two universities *jure metropolitico*, which being referred to the king and council, his majesty was pleased to give judgment against himself. As chancellor of Oxford his grace caused a new body of statutes to be drawn up for that university with a preface, in which are some severe reflections on good king Edward and his government; it says, that the discipline of the university was discomposed, and troubled by that king's injunctions, and the flattering novelty of the age. It then commends the reign of his sister the bloody queen Mary, and says, that the discipline of the church

* Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2 p. 450. † Usurpation of Prelates, p. 98. 115.

revived and flourished again in her days, under cardinal Pool, when by the much-desired felicity of those times an inbred candour supplied the defect of statutes.* Was this spoken like a Protestant prelate, whose predecessors in the sees of London and Canterbury were burnt at Oxford by queen Mary, in a most barbarous manner! Or rather like one, who was aiming at the return of those happy times!

The last and most extravagant stretch of episcopal power that I shall mention, was the bishops framing new articles of visitation in their own names, without the king's seal and authority; and administering an oath of inquiry to the churchwardens concerning them.† This was an outrage upon the laws, contrary to the act of submission, 25 Hen. VIII. cap. 25, and even to the twelfth canon of 1605, which says, "that whosoever shall affirm it lawful, for any sort of ministers, or lay-persons, to assemble together, and make rules, orders, and constitutions, in causes ecclesiastical, without the king's authority, and shall submit themselves to be ruled and governed by them, let him be excommunicated;" which includes the framers of the orders, as well as those who act under them. The administering an oath to churchwardens, without a royal commission, had no foundation in law; for by the common law, no ecclesiastical judge can administer an oath (except in cases of matrimony and testaments) without letters patent, or a special commission under the great seal. It was also declared contrary to the laws and statutes of the land, by sir Edward Coke and the rest of the judges, 3 James, in the case of Mr. Wharton, who, being churchwarden of Blackfriars, London, was excommunicated and imprisoned on a *capias excommunicatum*, for refusing to take an oath, to present upon visitation-articles; but bringing his *habeas corpus*, he was discharged by the whole court, both from his imprisonment and excommunication, for this reason, because the oath and articles were against the laws and statutes of this

* An answer from Mr. Neal, it is urged by Dr. Grey, may be supplied from Frankland's Annals of King Charles I. according to whom what is applied above to queen Mary's times only, relates to all former times, as well as hers, during which the uncertainty of the statutes lasted and put the university to an inconvenience; and who asserts, that the preface, mentioned by Mr. Neal, was written by Dr. Peter Turner, of Merton-college, a doctor of civil law. The reader, however, will probably apprehend, that it expressed the sentiments of archbishop Laud, and was virtually his. —Ed.

† Usurpation of Prelates, p. 229, 240.

realm, and so might and ought to be refused. Upon the whole, the making the mitre thus independent of the crown, and not subject to a prohibition from the courts of Westminster-hall, was setting up *imperium in imperio*, and going a great way toward re-establishing one of the heaviest grievances of the Papacy; but the bishops presumed upon the felicity of the times, and the indulgence of the crown, which at another time might have involved them in a premunire.

The articles of visitation differed in the several diocesses; the churchwardens' oath was generally the same, viz.

"You shall swear, that you, and every of you, shall duly consider and diligently inquire of all and every of these articles given you in charge; and that all affection, favour, hope of reward and gain, or fear of displeasure, or malice set aside, you shall present all and every such person that now is, or of late was, within your parish, or hath committed any offence, or made any default mentioned in any of these articles, or which are vehemently suspected, or defamed of any such offence or default, wherein you shall deal uprightly and fully, neither presenting nor daring to present any contrary to truth, having in this action God before your eyes, with an earnest zeal to maintain truth, and to suppress vice. So help you God, and the holy contents of this book."

By virtue of this oath, some out of conscience thought themselves obliged to present their ministers, their neighbours, and their near relations, not for immorality or neglect of the worship of God, but for omitting some superstitious injunctions. Others acted from revenge, having an opportunity put into their hands to ruin their conscientious neighbours. Many churchwardens refused to take the oath, and were imprisoned, and forced to do penance. But to prevent this for the future, it was declared, "that if any man affirmed, it was not lawful to take the oath of a churchwarden; or that it was not lawfully administered; or that the oath did not bind; or that the churchwardens need not inquire; or after inquiry need not answer, or might leave out part of their answers;"* such persons should be presented and punished.

Several of the bishops published their primary articles of visitation about this time; as, the archbishop of York, the

* Visit. Art. chap. 6. §. 9.

bishops of Winchester, and Bath and Wells; but the most remarkable and curious were Dr. Wren's bishop of Norwich, entitled, "Articles to be inquired of within the diocess of Norwich, in the first visitation of Matthew lord bishop of Norwich."* The book contains one hundred and thirty-nine articles, in which are eight hundred and ninety-seven questions, some very insignificant, others highly superstitious, and several impossible to be answered. To give the reader a specimen of them:——Have you the book of constitutions or canons ecclesiastical, and a parchment register-book, book of common-prayer, and a book of homilies?—Is your communion-table so placed within the chancel as the canon directs?—Doth your minister read the canons once every year?—Doth he pray for the king with his whole title?—Doth he pray for the archbishops and bishops?—Doth he observe all the orders, rites, and ceremonies, prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and administering the sacrament?—Doth he receive the sacrament kneeling himself, and administer to none but such as kneel?—Doth he admit to the sacrament any notorious offenders or schismatics?—Do the strangers of other parishes come often, or frequently, to your church?—Doth your minister baptize with the sign of the cross?—Is your minister licensed, and by whom?—Doth he wear the surplice while he is reading prayers and administering the sacrament?—Doth he catechise and instruct the youth in the ten commandments?—Doth he solemnize marriage without the banns?—Doth he in Rogation-days use the perambulation round the parish?—Doth he every six months denounce in the parish [or publicly declare the names of] all such as persevere in the sentence of excommunication, not seeking to be absolved?—Doth he admit any excommunicate persons into the church without a certificate of absolution?—Is your minister a favourer of recusants?—Is he noted to be an incontinent person; a frequenter of taverns, alehouses; a common gamester, or a player at dice?—Hath your minister read the book of sports in his church or chapel?—Doth he read the second service at the communion-table?—Doth he use conceived prayers before or after sermon?—With regard to churchyards, are they consecrated?—Are the graves dug

* Rushworth, vol. 2. part. 2. p. 186, 187. Prynne, p. 374. Rapin, vol. 2 p. 269, 990, folio edit.

east and west, and the bodies buried with their heads to the west?—Do your parishioners, at going in and out of the church, do reverence towards the chancel?—Do they kneel at confession, stand up at the creed, and bow at the glorious name of Jesus?* &c. with divers articles of the like nature.†

The weight of these inquiries fell chiefly upon the Puritans, for within the compass of two years and four months, no less than fifty able and pious ministers were suspended, silenced, and otherwise censured, to the ruin of their poor families, for not obeying one or other of these articles; among whom were, the reverend Mr. John Allen, Mr. John Ward, Mr. William Powel, Mr. John Carter, Mr. Ashe, Mr. Wm. Bridges, Mr. Jeremiah Burroughs, Mr. Greenhill, Mr. Edmund Calamy, Mr. Hudson, Peck, Raymond, Green, Mott, Kent, Allen, Scott, Beard, Moth, Manning, Warren, Kirrington, and others, in the diocess of Norwich. In other dioceses were, Mr. Jonathan Burre, Mr. William Leigh, Mr. Matthew Brownrigge, Mr. G. Huntley, Vicars, Proud, Workman, Crowder, Snelling, &c. some of whom spent their days in silence; others departed their country into parts beyond sea; and none were released without a promise to conform to the bishops' injunctions *editis et edendis*, i. e. already published, or hereafter to be published.

Bishop Montague, who succeeded Wren in the diocess of Norwich 1638, imitated his successor in his visitation-articles; it being now fashionable for every new bishop to frame separate articles of inquiry, for the visitation of his own diocess. Montague pointed his inquiries against the Puritan lecturers, of which he observes three sorts.‡

1. "Such as were superinducted into another man's cure; concerning which he enjoins his visitors to inquire, Whether the lecturer's sermons in the afternoons are popular or catechistical? Whether he be admitted with consent of the incumbent and bishop? Whether he read prayers in his

* Cant. Doom. p. 96.

† One article, which Mr. Neal has omitted, required, "that the churchwardens in every parish of the diocess should inquire, whether any persons presumed to talk of religion at their tables and in their families?" Not to say the gross ignorance which this restraint would cause, it shewed the extreme of jealousy and intolerance; was subversive of the influence and endearments of domestic life, and converted each private house into a court of inquisition. Pillars of Priestcraft and Orthodoxy shaken, [illegible], 808.—Ed.

‡ [illegible]

surplice and hood? Of what length his sermons are, and upon what subject? Whether he bids prayer, according to the fifty-fifth canon.

2. "The second sort of lecturers are those of combination, when the neighbouring ministers agreed to preach by turns at an adjoining market-town on market-days; inquire who the combiners are, and whether they conform as above?

3. A third sort are running lecturers, when neighbouring Christians agree upon such a day to meet at a certain church in some country town or village, and after sermon and dinner to meet at the house of one of their disciples to repeat censure, and explain the sermon; then to discourse of some points proposed at a foregoing meeting by the moderator of the assembly, derogatory to the doctrine or discipline of the church; and in conclusion to appoint another place for their next meeting. If you have any such lecturers, present them.

Dr. Pierse, bishop of Bath and Wells, suppressed all lecturers in market-towns, and elsewhere throughout his diocess, alleging, that he saw no such need of preaching now, as was in the apostles' days. He suspended Mr. Devenish, minister of Bridgewater, for preaching a lecture in his own church on a market-day, which had continued ever since the days of queen Elizabeth; and afterward, when he absolved him upon his promise to preach it no more, he said to him, "Go thy way, sin no more, lest a worse thing befal thee."* His lordship put down all afternoon sermons on Lord's days; and suspended Mr. Cornish for preaching a funeral sermon on the evening. And whereas some ministers used to explain the questions and answers in the catechism, and make a short prayer before and after, the bishop reproved them sharply for it, saying, that was as bad as preaching, and charged them to ask no questions, nor receive any answers but such as were in the Book of Common Prayer: and for not complying with this injunction, Mr. Barret, rector of Berwick, and some others, were enjoined public penance. The bishop of Peterborough, and all the new bishops, went in the same track; and some of them upon this sad principle, That afternoon sermons on Sundays were an impediment to the revels in the evening.

The church was now in the height of its triumphs, and

* Payne, p. 377.

grasped not only at all spiritual jurisdiction, but at the capital preferments of state. This year Dr. Juxon, bishop of London, was declared lord-high-treasurer of England, which is the first office of profit and power in the kingdom, and has precedence next to the archbishop. Juxon's name had hardly been known at court above two years;* till then he was no more than a private chaplain to the king, and head of a poor college in Oxford. Besides, no churchman had held this post since the darkest times of Popery, in the reign of king Henry VII. but Laud valued himself upon this nomination; "Now [says he in his diary] if the church will not hold up themselves, under God, I can do no more."† When the staff of treasurer was put into the hands of Juxon, lord Clarendon observes, "that the nobility were inflamed, and began to look upon the church as a gulf ready to swallow all the great offices of state, there being other churchmen in view who were ambitious enough to expect the rest. The inferior clergy took advantage of this situation of their affairs, and did not live towards their neighbours of quality, or patrons, with that civility and good manners as they used to do, which disposed others to withdraw their countenance and good neighbourhood from them, especially after they were put into the commissions of peace in most counties of England." One of the members of the house of commons said, "that the clergy were so exalted, that a gentleman might not come near the tail of their mules; and

* Dr. Juxon, having been elected to the see of Hereford, before he was consecrated, was translated on the 19th of September 1633, to that of London. His first preferment was, in 1627, to the deanery of Worcester; but his constant connexion with the court was not formed till the 10th of July 1632, when he was, at the suit of archbishop Laud, sworn clerk of his majesty's closet, two years and eight months before he was declared lord-high-treasurer. So that Mr. Neal's expression, that his name had hardly been known at court above two years, at which Dr. Grey carps, does not greatly deviate from the exact fact. The doctor quotes also many testimonies to the amiable temper and virtues of bishop Juxon. But though they justly reflect honour on his memory, the personal virtues of the bishop did not render the investing a clergyman with the high office to which he was exalted, a measure more politic in itself, or less obnoxious to the people. And the shorter was the time, during which he had been known at court, the fewer opportunities he had enjoyed to display his virtues, and the more probable it was that he owed his dignity, not to the excellence of his own character, but to the influence and views of Laud. This circumstance, together with the vast power connected with the office, and the exaltation supposed to be thus given to the clerical order, created jealousy and gave offence. In this light Mr. Neal places the matter, without impeaching the merit of bishop Juxon.—Ed.

† Bishop Warburton's remarks here deserve attention: "Had he been content [illegible] do nothing, the church had stood. Suppose him to have been [illegible] which I think must be granted, it would follow that he [illegible] of the constitution either of civil or religious society; and was as poor [illegible] a politician."—Ed.

that one of them had declared openly, that he hoped to see the day, when a clergyman should be as good a man as any upstart Jack gentleman in the kingdom." It is certain, the favourable aspect of the court had very much exalted their behaviour, and their new notions had made them conceive themselves an order of men above the rank of the laity, forasmuch as they had the keys of the kingdom of heaven at their girdle, and upon their priestly character depended the efficacy of all gospel institutions. This made some of them remarkably negligent of their cures up and down the country; others lost the little learning they had acquired at the university, and many became very scandalous in their lives; though lord Clarendon* says, that there was not one churchman in any degree of favour or acceptance [at court] of a scandalous insufficiency in learning, or of a more scandalous condition of life; but on the contrary, most of them of confessed eminent parts in knowledge, and of virtuous and unblemished lives.

Great numbers of the most useful and laborious preachers in all parts of the country were buried in silence, and forced to abscond from the fury of the high-commission; among whom were, the famous Mr. John Dod, Mr. Whately, Dr. Harris, Mr. Capel, and Mr. John Rogers of Dedham, one of the most awakening preachers of his age, of whom bishop Brownrigge used to say, "that he did more good with his wild notes, than we [the bishops] with our set music." Yet his great usefulness could not screen him from those suspensions and deprivations which were the portion of the Puritans in these times. His resolutions about subscribing I will relate in his own words: "If I come into trouble for nonconformity, I resolve, by God's assistance, to come away with a clear conscience; for though the liberty of my ministry be dear to me, I dare not buy it at such a rate. I am troubled at my former subscription, but I saw men of good gifts, and of good hearts (as I thought), go before me; and I could not prove that there was any thing contrary to the word of God, though I disliked the ceremonies, and knew them to be unprofitable burdens to the church of God; but if I am urged again I will never yield; it was my weakness before, as I now conceive, which I beseech God to pardon. —Written in the year 1627." But after this the good man

* Vol. 1 p. 77.

was overtaken again, and yielded, which almost broke his heart; he adds, "—For this I smarted, 1631. If I had read over this [my former resolution] it may be I had not done what I did." How severe are such trials to a poor man with a numerous family of children! And how sore the distresses of a wounded conscience!

Others continued to leave their country, according to our blessed Saviour's advice, Matt. x. 23, "When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another." Among these were Mr. Nathaniel Rogers, son of Mr. John Rogers of Dedham, educated in Emanuel-college, Cambridge, and settled at Assington in Suffolk, where he continued five years; but seeing the storm that had driven his neighbours from their anchor, and being fearful of his own steadfastness in the hour of temptation, he resigned his living into the hands of his patron, and forsaking the neighbourhood of his father, and all prospects of worldly advantage, cast himself and his young family upon the providence of God, and embarked for New England, where he arrived about the middle of November 1636, and settled with Mr. Norton, at Ipswich, with whom he continued to his death, which happened in the year 1655.

About the same time went over Mr. Lambert Whiteing, M. A. a Lincolnshire divine, who continued at Shirbeck near Boston unmolested, till bishop Williams's disgrace, after which he was silenced by the spiritual courts, and forced into New England, where he arrived with his family this summer, and continued a useful preacher to a little flock at Lynn till the year 1679, when he died in the eighty-third year of his age.

The star-chamber and high-commission exceeded all the bounds not only of law and equity, but even of humanity itself.* We have related the sufferings of Mr. Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, in the year 1633. These gentlemen, being shut up in prison, were supposed to employ their time in writing against the bishops and their spiritual courts; Bastwick was charged with a book published 1636, entitled, "Apologeticus ad præsules Anglicanos;" and with a pamphlet called "The new litany:" the others, with two anonymous books, one entitled, "A divine tragedy, containing a catalogue of God's judgments against sabbath-breakers;"

* Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 380, &c.

the other, "'News from Ipswich;" which last was a satire upon the severe proceedings of Dr. Wren bishop of that diocess. For these they were cited a second time into the star-chamber, by virtue of an information laid against them by the attorney-general, for writing and publishing seditious, schismatical, and libellous books against the hierarchy of the church, and to the scandal of the government. When the defendants had prepared their answers, they could not get counsel to sign them; upon which they petitioned the court to receive them from themselves, which would not be admitted; however, Prynne and Bastwick, having no other remedy, left their answers at the office, signed with their own hands, but were nevertheless proceeded against *pro confesso*. Burton prevailed with Mr. Holt, a bencher of Gray's inn, to sign his answer; but the court ordered the two chief justices to expunge what they thought unfit to be brought into court, and they struck out the whole answer, except six lines at the beginning, and three or four at the end; and because Mr. Burton would not acknowledge it thus purged, he was also taken *pro confesso*.

In Bastwick's answer the prelates are called "invaders of the king's prerogative, contemners and despisers of the Holy Scriptures, advancers of Popery, superstition, idolatry, and profaneness; they are charged with oppressing the king's loyal subjects, and with great cruelty, tyranny, and injustice." Mr. Prynne's answer reflected upon the hierarchy, though in more moderate and cautious terms. All the defendants offered to maintain their several answers at the peril of their lives; but the court, finding them not filed upon record, would not receive them. The prisoners at the bar cried aloud for justice, and that their answers might be read; but it was peremptorily denied, and the following sentence passed upon them; that "Mr. Burton be deprived of his living, and degraded from his ministry, as Prynne and Bastwick had been from their professions of law and physic; that each of them be fined 5,000*l.*; that they stand in the pillory at Westminster, and have their ears cut off; and because Mr. Prynne had already lost his ears by sentence of the court 1633, it was ordered that the remainder of his stumps should be cut off, and that he should be stigmatized on both cheeks with the letters S. L. and then all three were to suffer perpetual imprisonment in the remotest pri-

sons of the kingdom." This sentence was executed upon them June 30, 1637, the hangman rather sawing the remainder of Prynne's ears than cutting them off; after which they were sent under a strong guard, one to the castle of Launceston in Cornwall, another to the castle of Lancaster, and a third to Carnarvon-castle in Wales;* but these prisons not being thought distant enough, they were afterward removed to the islands of Scilly, Guernsey, and Jersey, where they were kept without the use of pen, ink, or paper, or the access of friends, till they were released by the long parliament.

At passing this sentence archbishop Laud made a laboured speech, to clear himself from the charge of innovations, with which the Puritans loaded him. He begins with retorting the crime upon the Puritans, who were for setting aside the order of bishops, whereas in all ages since the apostles' time the church had been governed by bishops, whose calling and order, in his grace's opinion, was by divine right, the office of lay-elders having never been heard of before Calvin. He then vindicates the particular innovations complained of; as, 1. Bowing towards the altar, or at coming into the church. This he says was the practice in Jewish times; Psal. xcv. 6, "O come, let us worship, and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord our maker;" and yet the government is so moderate, that no man is forced to it, but only religiously called upon. "For my own part (says his grace) I shall always think myself bound to worship with my body as well as soul, in what consecrated place soever I come to pray. You, my honoured lords of the garter, do reverence towards the altar, as the greatest place of God's residence upon earth; greater than the pulpit, for there is only the word of God, but upon the altar is his body; and a greater reverence is due to the body than to the word of the Lord; and this is no innovation, for you are bound to it by your order, which is no new thing."

His grace proceeds to consider the alterations in the col-

* The archbishop's revenge, not glutted by the severe sentence obtained against Mr. Prynne, pursued those who, at Chester and other places, as he was carrying to prison, showed him civilities. For, though his keepers were not forbidden to let any visit him, some were fined 500*l.* some 300*l.* and other [illegible]. Rushworth Abridged, vol. [illegible] p. [illegible] &c., as quoted in the Pillars of Priestcraft and Orthodoxy, vol. 3. p. [illegible]. And the servant of Mr. Prynne was proceeded against in the high-commission, and sent from prison to prison, only for refusing to accuse his master. Id. p. [illegible]. Neither fidelity nor humanity had merit with this prelate.—Ed.

lects and prayers, which he says the archbishops and bishops, to whom the ordering of the fast-book was committed, had power under the king to make, provided nothing was inserted contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the church of England; he then justifies the several amendments, and concludes most of his articles with shewing that there is no connexion between the charge and the popular clamour raised against him, of an intent to bring in Popery. But the several innovations here mentioned being objected to the archbishop at his trial, we shall defer our remarks to that place.

His grace concludes with a protestation, that he had no design to alter the religion established by law; but that his care to reduce the church to order, to uphold the external decency of it, and to settle it to the rules of the first reformation, had brought upon him and his brethren, all that malicious storm that had loured so black over their heads. He then thanks the court for their just and honourable censure of these men, and for their defence of the church; but because the business had some reference to himself, he forbears to censure them, leaving them to God's mercy and the king's justice.

Notwithstanding this plausible speech, which the king ordered to be printed, the barbarous sentence passed upon these gentlemen moved the compassion of the whole nation. The three learned faculties of law, physic, and divinity, took it to heart, as thinking their educations and professions might have secured them from such infamous punishments,* proper enough for the poorest and most mechanic malefactors, who could make no other satisfaction to the public for their offences; but very improper for persons of education, degrees, or quality. Nay, the report of this censure, and the smart execution of it, flew into Scotland, and the discourse was there, that they must also expect a star-chamber to strengthen the hands of their bishops, as well as a high-commission: "No doubt (says archbishop Laud) but there is a concurrence between them and the Puritan party in England, to destroy me in the king's opinion."†

Cruel as this sentence was, Dr. Williams, *bishop* of Lincoln, and the reverend Mr. Osbaldeston, *chief* master of Westminster-school, met with no less hardship.‡ The bi-

* Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 91.
† Rushworth, p. 101.
‡ Ibid. vol. 2. Part 2. p. 61.

shop had been Laud's very good friend, in persuading king James to advance him to a bishoprick; but upon the accession of king Charles he turned upon his benefactor, and got him removed from all his preferments at court; upon which bishop Williams retired to his diocess,* and spent his time in reading and in the good government of his diocess; here he became popular, entertaining the clergy at his table, and discoursing freely about affairs of church and state.† He spoke with some smartness against the new ceremonies; and said once in conversation, "that the Puritans were the king's best subjects, and he was sure would carry all at last; and that the king had told him, that he would treat the Puritans more mildly for the future." Laud, being informed of this expression, caused an information to be lodged against him in the star-chamber, for revealing the king's secrets; but the charge not being well supported, a new bill was exhibited against him, for tampering with the king's witnesses; and though there was very little ground for the charge, his lordship was suspended in the high-commission-court from all his offices and benefices; he was fined 10,000*l.* to the king; 1,000*l.* to sir John Mounson, and to be imprisoned in the Tower during the king's pleasure. The bishop was accordingly sent from the bar to the Tower;‡ all his rich goods and chattels, to an immense value, were plundered and sold to pay the fine; his library seized, and all his papers and letters examined. Among his papers were found two or three letters written to him by Mr. Osbaldeston about five years before, in which were some dark and obscure expressions, which the jealous archbishop inter-

* The remarks of bishop Warburton on the proceedings against Dr. Williams, are just, though severe, and by their impartiality and spirit, do honour to his lordship. "This prosecution (says he) must needs give every one a bad idea of Laud's heart and temper. You might resolve his high acts of power in the state, into reverence and gratitude to his master; his tyranny in the church, to his zeal for and love of what he called religion; but the outrageous prosecution of these two men can be resolved into nothing but envy and revenge: and actions like these they were which occasioned all that bitter, but indeed just, exclamation against the bishops in the speeches of lord Falkland and lord Digby."—Ed.

† Rushworth, p. 417.

‡ Here he was kept in close imprisonment about four years. During his confinement, in order to deprive him of his bishoprick, he was examined upon a book of articles of twenty-four sheets. Amongst which were such frivolous charges as these: viz. that he had called a book entitled "A coal from the altar," a pamphlet: that he had said, that all flesh in England had corrupted their ways; that he had wickedly jested on St. Martin's hood. What must be thought of the temper of those who could think of depriving a bishop of his see on such grounds? The bishop was however so wary in his answers, that they could take no advantage against him. Fuller's Church Hist. b. 11. p. 197, &c.

preted against himself and the lord-treasurer Weston. Upon the foot of these letters a new bill was exhibited against the bishop for divulging scandalous libels against the king's privy-counsellors. His lordship replied, that he did not remember his having received the letters, and was sure he had never divulged them, because they were still among his private papers; but notwithstanding all he could say, he was condemned in a fine of 8,000*l.*; 5,000*l.* to the king, and 3,000*l.* to the archbishop; for the nonpayment of which he was kept close prisoner in the Tower till the meeting of the long parliament.

The reverend Mr. Osbaldeston was charged with plotting with the bishop of Lincoln to divulge false news, and to breed a difference between the lord-treasurer Weston and the archbishop of Canterbury, as long ago as the year 1634.* The information was grounded upon the two letters already mentioned, in which he reports a misunderstanding between the great leviathan and the little urchin. And though the counsel for the defendant absolutely denied any reference to the archbishop, and named the persons meant in the letter, yet "the court fined him 5,000*l.* to the king, and 5,000*l.* to the archbishop; to be deprived of all his spiritual dignities and promotions, to be imprisoned during the king's pleasure, and to stand in the pillory in the dean's yard before his own school, and have his ears nailed to it." Mr. Osbaldeston being among the crowd in the court when this sentence was pronounced, immediately went home to his study at Westminster-school, and having burnt some papers, absconded, leaving a note upon his desk with these words, "If the archbishop inquire after me, tell him I am gone beyond Canterbury." The messengers were soon at his house, and finding this note, sent immediately to the seaports to apprehend him; but he lay hid in a private house in Drury-lane till the search was over, and then concealed himself till the meeting of the long parliament; however, all his goods and chattels were seized and confiscated. This Mr. Osbaldeston was M. A. of Christ-church college, Oxford, and prebendary of Westminster; he was an admirable master, and had eighty doctors in the two universities that had been his scholars, before the year 1640;† he was afterward restored by the long parliament, but when he apprehended

* Rushworth, vol. 2 part 2. p. 803—817. † Athenæ Oxon. vol. 1. p. 855.

they went beyond the bounds of their duty and allegiance, he laid down his school and favoured the royal cause.

Mr. Lilburne, afterward a colonel in the army, for refusing to take an oath to answer all interrogatories concerning his importing and publishing seditious libels, was fined 500*l.* and to be whipped through the streets from the Fleet to the pillory before Westminster-hall gate, April 8, 1638. While he was in the pillory he uttered many bold and passionate speeches against the tyranny of the bishops; whereupon the court of star-chamber, then sitting, ordered him to be gagged, which was done accordingly; and that, when he was carried back to prison, he should be laid alone with irons on his hands and legs in the wards of the Fleet, where the basest of the prisoners used to be put, and that no person should be admitted to see him. Here he continued in a most forlorn and miserable condition till the meeting of the long parliament.

In the midst of all these dangers the Puritan clergy spoke freely against their oppressors.* Dr. Cornelius Burges, in a Latin sermon before the clergy of London, preached against the severities of the bishops, and refusing to give his diocesan a copy of his sermon, was put into the high-commission. Mr. Wharton of Essex preached with the same freedom at Chelmsford, for which, it is said, he made his submission. Several pamphlets were dispersed against the proceedings of the ecclesiastical courts, which the bishop of London declared he had reason to believe were written or countenanced by the clergy of his own diocess. Many private gentlemen in Suffolk maintained lecturers at their own expense, without consulting the bishop, who complained that they were factious, and did not govern themselves according to the canons; but, says his lordship [Wren], "What shall I do with such scholars, some in orders and others not, which gentlemen of figure entertain in their houses under pretence of teaching their children? and with those beneficed divines who take shelter in the houses of the rich laity, and do not live upon their cures?"† Here was the Puritans' last retreat; those who were not willing to go abroad found entertainment in gentlemen's families, and from thence annoyed the enemy with their pamphlets. Even the populace, who were not capable of writing, expressed their resentments against the archbishop

* Wood's Athenæ Oxon, vol. 2. p. 215. † Rushworth, p. 467.

by dispersing libels about the town, in which they threatened his destruction. His grace has entered some of them in his diary.

"Wednesday, August 23. My lord-mayor sent me a libel found by the watch at the south-gate of St. Paul's, that the devil had left that house to me.

"Aug. 25. Another libel was brought me by an officer of the high-commission, fastened to the north-gate of St. Paul's, that the government of the church of England is a candle in a snuff, going out in a stench.

"The same night the lord-mayor sent me another libel, hanged upon the standard in Cheapside, which was my speech in the star-chamber set in the pillory.

"A few days after, another short libel was sent me in verse."

Yet none of these things abated his zeal, or relaxed his rigour against those who censured his arbitrary proceedings.

It was impossible to debate things fairly in public, because the press was absolutely at his grace's disposal, according to a new decree of the star-chamber made this summer, which ordains, that "no book be printed unless it be first licensed with all its titles, epistles, and prefaces, by the archbishop, or bishop of London for the time being, or by their appointment; and within the limits of the university, by the chancellor or vice-chancellor, on pain of the printer's being disabled from his profession for the future, and to suffer such other punishment as the high-commission shall think fit. That before any books imported from abroad be sold, a catalogue of them shall be delivered to the archbishop, or bishop of London, to be perused by themselves, or their chaplains. And if there be any schismatical or offensive books, they shall be delivered up to the bishop, or to the high-commission, that the offenders may be punished. It was farther ordained, that no person shall print beyond sea any English book or books, whereof the greatest part is English, whether formerly printed or not; nor shall any book be reprinted, though formerly licensed, without a new licence. And finally, if any person that is not an allowed printer, shall set up a printing-press, he shall be set in the pillory, and be whipped through the streets of London."

These terrible proceedings, instead of serving the interests of the church or state, awakened the resentments of all ranks and professions of men, against those in power: the laity were as uneasy as the clergy, many of whom sold their effects, and removed with their families and trades into Holland or New England. This alarmed the king and council, who issued out a proclamation, April 30th, 1637, to the following purpose:* "—— The king being informed, that great numbers of his subjects were yearly transported into New England with their families and whole estates, that they might be out of the reach of ecclesiastical authority; his majesty therefore commands, that his officers of the several ports should suffer none to pass without licence from the commissioners of the plantations, and a testimonial from their minister of their conformity to the orders and discipline of the church." And to bar the ministers, the following order of council was published;

"Whereas it is observed, that such ministers who are not conformable to the discipline and ceremonies of the church, do frequently transport themselves to the plantations, where they take liberty to nourish their factious and schismatical humours, to the hinderance of the good conformity and unity of the church; we therefore expressly command you, in his majesty's name, to suffer no clergyman to transport himself without a testimonial from the archbishop of Canterbury and bishop of London."†

This was a degree of severity hardly to be paralleled in the Christian world. When the edict of Nantz was revoked the French king allowed his Protestant subjects a convenient time to dispose of their effects, and depart the kingdom; but our Protestant archbishop will neither let the Puritans live peaceably at home, nor take sanctuary in foreign countries; a conduct hardly consistent with the laws of humanity, much less with the character of a Christian bishop; but while his grace was running things to these extremities, the people (as has been observed) took a general disgust, and almost all England became Puritan.

The bishops and courtiers being not insensible of the number and weight of their enemies among the more resolved Protestants, determined to balance their power by joining the Papists; for which purpose the differences be-

* Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 401. † Ibid. p. 410.

tween the two churches were said to be trifling, and the peculiar doctrines of Popery printed and preached up, as proper to be received by the church of England. Bishop Montague, speaking of the points of faith and morality, affirmed, that none of these are controverted between us, but that "the points in dispute were of a lesser nature, of which a man might be ignorant without any danger of salvation."* Franciscus de Clara, an eminent Franciscan friar, published a book, wherein he endeavoured to accommodate the articles of the church of England to the sense of the church of Rome, so that both parties might subscribe them. The book was dedicated to the king, and the friar admitted to an acquaintance with the archbishop.†

Great stress was laid upon the uninterrupted succession of the episcopal character through the church of Rome; for "miserable were we (says Dr. Pocklington) if he that now sits archbishop of Canterbury could not derive his succession from St. Austin, St. Austin from St. Gregory, and St. Gregory from St. Peter." Dr. Heylin, in his moderate answer to Mr. Burton, has these words; "That my lord of Canterbury that now is, is lineally descended from St. Peter in a most fair and constant tenor of succession, you shall easily find if you consult the learned labours of Mason 'De Ministerio Anglicano.'"

Bishop Montague published a treatise, "Of the invocation of saints," in which he says, that "departed saints have not only a memory, but a more peculiar charge of their friends; and that some saints have a peculiar patronage, custody, protection, and power, as angels have also, over certain persons and countries by special deputation; and that it is not impiety so to believe."‡ Dr. Cosins says, in one of his sermons, that "when our reformers took away the mass, they marred all religion; but that the mass was not taken away

* Rushworth, part 1. p. 214.

† Grey quotes a passage from the trial of Laud, by which it appears that he denied having given any encouragement to the publication of this book, and had absolutely prohibited its being printed in England; that Clara was never with him till the book was ready for the press, nor afterward above twice or thrice at most, when he made great friends to obtain the archbishop's sanction to his printing another book, to prove that bishops are by divine right; and his request was again refused. For the archbishop replied, "that he did not like the way which the church of Rome went in the case of episcopacy; would never consent to the printing of any such book here from the pen of a Romanist, and that the bishops of England were able to defend their own cause, without calling in the aid of the church of Rome, and would in due time."—Ed.

‡ Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 214

inasmuch as the real presence of Christ remained still, otherwise it were not a reformed, but a deformed religion." And in order to persuade a Papist to come to church, he told him, that the body of Christ was substantially and really in the sacrament.* This divine printed a collection of private devotions, in imitation of the Roman Horary. The frontispiece had three capital letters, J. H. S. upon these there was a cross encircled with the sun, supported by two angels, with two devout women praying towards it. The book contains the Apostles' creed, the Lord's prayer divided into seven petitions, the precepts of charity, the seven sacraments, the three theological virtues, the eight beatitudes, the seven deadly sins; with forms of prayer for the first, third, sixth, and ninth hours, and for the vespers and compline, formerly called the canonical hours; then followed the litany, with prayers for the sacrament, in time of sickness, and at the approach of death. This book was licensed by the bishop of London, and publicly sold when the books of the most resolved Protestants were suppressed.

Mr. Adams, in a sermon at St. Mary's in Cambridge, asserted the expedience of auricular confession, saying, it was as necessary to salvation as meat is to the body.† Others preached up the doctrine of penance, and of authoritative priestly absolution for sin. Some maintained the proper merit of good works, in opposition to the received doctrine of justification by faith alone. Others, that in the sacrament of the Lord's supper there was a full and proper sacrifice for sin. Some declared for images, crucifixes, and pictures in churches, for purgatory, and for preserving, reverencing, and even praying to, the relics of saints. The author of the English Pope, printed 1643, says, that Sparrow paved the way for auricular confession, Watts for penance, Heylin for altar-worship, Montague for saint-worship, and Laud for the mass.

It was a very just observation of a Venetian gentleman in his travels to England about this time,‡ "that the universities, bishops, and divines, of England, daily embraced Catholic doctrines, though they professed them not with open mouth: they held that the church of Rome was a true church; that the pope was superior to all bishops; that to

* Collyer's Eccles. Hist. p. 742.
† Rushworth, p. 137. Prynne, p. 120, &c. ‡ Mary's Hist of Paul p 28.

him it pertained to call general councils: that it was lawful to pray for souls departed; and that altars ought to be erected in all churches; in sum, they believed all that was taught by the church of Rome, but not by the court of Rome." Remarkable are the words of Heylin to the same purpose:* "The greatest part of the controversy between us and the church of Rome (says he), not being in fundamentals, or in any essential points of the Christian religion, I cannot otherwise look upon it but as a most Christian and pious work, to endeavour an agreement in the superstructure; as to the lawfulness of it, I could never see any reason produced against it: against the impossibility of it, it has been objected, that the church of Rome will yield nothing; if therefore there be an agreement, it must not be their meeting us, but our going to them; but that all in the church of Rome are not so stiff, appears from the testimony of the archbishop of Spalato, who acknowledged that the articles of the church of England were not heretical, and by the treatise of Franciscus de Clara.† Now if, without prejudice to truth, the controversies might be composed, it is most probable that other Protestant churches would have sued to be included in the peace; if not, the church of England will lose nothing by it, as being hated by the Calvinists, and not loved by the Lutherans." This was the ridiculous court-scheme which archbishop Laud used all his interest to accomplish; and it is no impertinent story to our present purpose, because it is well attested, that a certain countess (whose husband's father the archbishop had married, and thereby brought himself into trouble) having turned Papist, was asked by the archbishop the cause of her changing, to whom she re-

* Fuller's Appeal, part 3. p. 65. 68.

† His real name was Christopher Davenport. He was the son of an alderman of Coventry, and with his brother John was sent to Merton-college in Oxford, in the year 1613. John became afterward a noted Puritan, and then an Independent. Christopher, by the invitation of some Romish priests, living in or near Oxford, went to study at Douay in 1616. He afterward spent some time in the university of Salamanca, from whence he returned to Douay, and read first philosophy, and then divinity there. At length he became a missionary into England, and a chaplain to queen Henrietta Maria, under the name of Franciscus a Sancta Clara. Amongst many learned works, of which he was the author, was "An exposition of the thirty-nine articles in the most favourable sense." "But (says bishop Warburton) it pleased neither party." The Spanish inquisition put it into the Index Expurgatorius; and it would have been condemned at Rome, had not the king and archbishop Laud procured Panzani, the pope's agent at London, to stop the prosecution. He died the 31st of May, 1680. Warburton's supplemental volume, p. 104, and Wood's Athenæ Oxon, vol. 2. p. 415, &c.—Ed.

plied, it was because she always hated to go in a crowd. Being asked again the reason of that expression, she answered, that she perceived his grace and many others were making haste to Rome, and therefore to prevent going in a press she had gone before them.*

It is certain the Papists were in high reputation at court; the king counted them his best subjects, and relaxed the penal laws, on pretence that hereby foreign Catholic princes might be induced to shew favour to their subjects of the reformed religion. Within the compass of four years, seventy-four letters of grace were signed by the king's own hand; sixty-four priests were dismissed from the Gate-house, and twenty-nine by warrant from the secretary of state, at the instance of the queen, the queen-mother, or some foreign ambassador. Protections were frequently granted, to put a stop to the proceedings of the courts of justice against them.† I have before me a list of Popish recusants, convicted in the twenty-nine English counties of the southern division, from the first of king Charles to the sixteenth, which amounts to no less than eleven thousand nine hundred and seventy‡ (as the account was brought into the long parliament by Mr. John Pulford, employed in their prosecution by the king himself), all of whom were released and pardoned. And if their numbers were so great in the south, how must they abound in the northern and Welsh counties, where they are computed three to one!

Many of them were promoted to places of the highest honour and trust; sir Richard Weston was lord-high-treasurer, sir Francis Windebank secretary of state, lord Cottington was chancellor of the exchequer, and Mr. Porter of the bed-chamber; besides these, there were, lord Conway, sir Kenelm Digby, sir Toby Mathews, Mr. Montague, jun. the dutchess of Montague, the countess of Newport, and many others, all Papists, who were in high favour,§ and had the king and queen's ear whensoever they pleased. The pope had a nuncio in England, and the queen an agent at Rome; cardinal Barberini was made protector of the English nation, and a society was erected under the title of "The congregation for propagating the faith."‖ Richard

* Fuller's Appeal, p. 61.
† Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 284.
‡ Foxes and Firebrands, part 3. p. 75.
§ Collyer's Eccles. Hist. vol. 2. p. 780.
‖ Fuller's Church History, b. 11. p. 137. Prynne, p. 190.

Smith, titular bishop of Chalcedon, exercised episcopal jurisdiction over the English Catholics by commission from the pope; he conferred orders, and appeared in Lancashire with his mitre and crosier;* seignior Con or Cunæus, the pope's legate, gained over several of the gentry, and attempted the king himself by presents of little Popish toys and pictures, with which his majesty was wonderfully delighted.† The Papists had a common purse,‡ with which they purchased several monopolies, and bestowed the profits upon their best friends; several of their military men were put into commission, and great numbers were listed in his majesty's armies against the Scots.§

But let the reader form his judgment of the number and strength of the Roman Catholics from lord Clarendon,‖ who says, "The Papists had for many years enjoyed a great calm, being on the matter absolved from the severest parts of the law, and dispensed with for the gentlest. They were grown to be a part of the revenue, without any probable danger of being made a sacrifice to the law. They were looked upon as good subjects at court, and good neighbours

* Foxes and Firebrands, part 3. p. 124.

† Mr. Neal here goes beyond his author, who says, "which yet could prevail nothing with the king." But then he remarks in the margin, that it "was strange that the king did not send Cunæus packing, when he thus tempted and assaulted him." On the truth and force of this remark, it may be presumed, that Mr. Neal grounded his representation of the king's being delighted with the legate's presents. For instead of dismissing him, he often received him at Hampton-court, and solicited his services for the Palatinate; which certainly indicated no displeasure at his gifts.—Ed.

‡ Foxes and Firebrands, part 3. p. 134.

§ Dr. Grey properly observes, that the place in Collyer to which Mr. Neal here refers, mentions not one syllable of this. The truth is, that Collyer is alleged only to prove the influence which the Papists had at court. I have, therefore, annexed the reference to a preceding sentence. The doctor adds, "nor do I believe, that he (*i. e.* Mr. Neal) can produce the least authority for his assertion, that great numbers of Papists were listed in his majesty's armies against the Scots." It is to be wished, that Mr. Neal had referred here exactly to his authority. But to supply this omission, it may be observed, that the queen employed sir Kenelm Digby and Mr. Walter Montague to raise liberal contributions for the war from the Papists, whose clergy vied with the English on this occasion; on this ground, some styled the forces raised, the Popish army. This circumstance renders it, to say the least, exceedingly probable that Papists were enlisted. It was afterward charged on the king, that he employed them in his armies; the earl of Newcastle did not deny it; and the parliament produced lists of Popish officers in the king's service, with their names, quality, and employs. It was also urged against the parliament, that there were great numbers of Papists, both commanders and others, in their army. Dr. Grey quotes Dugdale to prove this. Rapin observes on this charge, that not a single Catholic was named by those who brought the charge, nor were the muster-rolls, to which the appeal was made, ever published. Whitelocke's Memoirs, p. 31. Mrs. Macaulay's History, vol. 2. p. 270. 8vo. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 462. 466. folio. An Essay towards a true Idea of the Character and Reign of Charles I. p. 69; and Dugdale's Short View of the Troubles, &c. p. 105. 504.—Ed.

‖ Vol. 1. p. 140.

in the country; all the restraints and reproaches of former times being forgotten: but they were not prudent managers of their prosperity, being elated with the connivance and protection they received; and though I am persuaded their numbers increased not, their pomp and boldness did to that degree, that, as if they affected to be thought dangerous to the state, they appeared more publicly, entertained and urged conferences more avowedly, than had before been known. They resorted at common hours to mass to Somerset-house, and returned thence in great multitudes with the same barefacedness as others come from the Savoy, or other neighbouring churches. They attempted, and sometimes gained, proselytes, of weak uninformed ladies, with such circumstances as provoked the rage, and destroyed the charity, of great and powerful families, which longed for their suppression; they grew not only secret contrivers, but public professed promoters of, and ministers in, the most odious and most grievous projects, as in that of soap, formed, framed, and executed, by almost a corporation of that religion, which under that licence and notion might be, and were suspected to be, qualified for other agitations. The priests and such as were in orders (orders that in themselves were punishable with death) were departed from their former modesty and fear, and were as willing to be known as to be hearkened to; insomuch that a Jesuit at Paris, who was coming for England, had the boldness to visit the ambassador there, who knew him to be such, and offering him his service, acquainted him with his journey, as if there had been no laws there for his reception; and for the most invidious protection and countenance of that whole party, a public agent from Rome (first Mr. Con a Scottish man, and after him the count of Rosetti an Italian) resided in London in great pomp, publicly visited the court, and was avowedly resorted to by the Catholics of all conditions, over whom he assumed a particular jurisdiction, and was caressed and presented magnificently by the ladies of honour who inclined to that profession. They had likewise, with more noise and vanity than prudence would have admitted, made public collections of money to a considerable sum, upon some recommendations from the queen, and to be by her majesty presented, as a free-will-offering from his Roman-Catholic subjects to the king, for the carrying on the war

against the Scots; which drew upon them the rage of that nation, with little devotion and reverence to the queen herself, as if she desired to suppress the Protestant religion in one kingdom as well as the other, by the arms of the Roman Catholics."

From this account, compared with the foregoing relation, it is evident there never was a stronger combination in favour of Popery, nor was the Protestant religion at any time in a more dangerous crisis, being deserted by its pretended friends, while it was secretly undermining by its most powerful enemies.

The case was the same with the civil liberties and properties of the people; no man had any thing that he could call his own any longer than the king pleased; for in the famous trial of Mr. Hampden of Buckinghamshire, in the case of ship-money, all the judges of England, except Crook and Hutton,* gave it for law, "that the king might levy taxes on the subject by writ under the great seal, without grant of parliament, in cases of necessity; or when the kingdom was in danger; of which danger and necessity his majesty was the sole and final judge; and that by law his majesty might compel the doing thereof in case of refusal or refractoriness." This determination was entered in all the courts of Westminster-hall; and the judges were commanded to declare it in their circuits throughout the kingdom, to the end that no man might plead ignorance. "The damage and mischief cannot be expressed (says lord Clarendon†) that the crown sustained by the deserved reproach and infamy that attended this behaviour of the judges, who out of their courtship submited the grand questions of law to be measured by what they call the standard of general reason and necessity." While these extraordinary methods of raising money were built only upon the prerogative, people were more patient, hoping that some time or other the law would recover its power; but when they were declared by all the judges to be the very law itself, and a rule for determining suits between the king and subject, they were struck with despair, and concluded very justly that magna charta and the old English constitution were at an end.

Let the reader now recollect himself, and then judge of the candour of the noble historian, who, notwithstanding

* Rapin, vol. 2 p. 20[illegible], [illegible] folio edit. † Vol 1. p. 70.

the cruel persecutions and oppressions already mentioned, celebrates the felicity of these times in the following words: "Now, after all this, I must be so just as to say, that from the dissolution of the parliament in the fourth year of the king, to the beginning of the long parliament, which was about twelve years, this kingdom and all his majesty's dominions enjoyed the greatest calm, and the fullest measure of felicity, that any people, in any age, for so long time together, have been blessed with, to the wonder and envy of all other parts of Christendom:—the court was in great plenty, or rather excess and luxury, the country rich and full, enjoying the pleasure of its own wealth; the church flourished with learned and extraordinary men; and the Protestant religion was more advanced against the church of Rome, by the writings of archbishop Laud and Chillingworth, than it had been since the reformation.—Trade increased to that degree, that we were the exchange of Christendom; foreign merchants looking upon nothing so much their own as what they had laid up in the warehouses of this kingdom.—The reputation of the greatness and power of the king with foreign princes was much more than any of his progenitors. And lastly, for a complement of all these blessings, they were enjoyed under the protection of a king of the most harmless disposition, the most exemplary piety, and the greatest sobriety, chastity, and mercy, that any prince had been endowed with, and who might have said that which Pericles was proud of upon his deathbed, concerning his citizens, 'that no Englishman had worn a mourning-gown through his occasion.' In a word, many wise men thought it a time wherein those two adjuncts, *imperium* and *libertas*, were as well reconciled as possible."*

Not a line of this panegyric will bear examination. When his lordship says, "that no people in any age had been blessed with so great a calm, and such a full measure of felicity for so long a time together [twelve years]," he seems to have undervalued the long and pacific reign of his majesty's royal father, king James, who was distinguished by the title of Blessed. But where was the liberty or safety of the subject, when magna charta and the petition of right, which the king had signed in full parliament, were swallow-

* Lord Clarendon's Representation of the Times, vol. i. p. 74. 76.

ed up in the gulf of arbitrary power? and the statute laws of the land were exchanged for a rule of government depending upon the sovereign will and pleasure of the crown? If the court was in excess and luxury, it was with the plunder of the people, arising from loans, benevolences, ship-money, monopolies, and other illegal taxes on merchandise. The country was so far from growing rich and wealthy, that it was every year draining off its inhabitants and substance, as appears not only by the loss of the foreign manufacturers, but by his majesty's proclamations, forbidding any of his subjects to transport themselves and their effects to New England without his special licence. Was it possible that trade could flourish, when almost every branch of it was engrossed, and sold by the crown for large sums of money, and when the property of the subject was so precarious, that the king might call for it upon any occasion, and in case of refusal ruin the proprietor by exorbitant fines and imprisonment? Did no Englishman wear a mourning-gown in these times, when the Seldens, the Hollises, the Elliots, the Strouds, the Hobarts, the Valentines, the Coritons, and other patriots, were taken out of the parliament-house, and shut up for many years in close prisons, where some of them perished? How many of the nobility and gentry were punished with exorbitant fines in the star-chamber? how many hundred ministers and others were ruined in the high-commission, or forced from their native country into banishment, contrary to law? The jails in the several counties were never free from state or church prisoners during the past twelve years of his majesty's reign, and yet it seems no Englishman wore a mourning-gown through his occasion! Is it possible to believe, that the reputation of the greatness and power of king Charles I. with foreign princes (however harmless, pious, sober, chaste, and merciful, he might be) was equal to that of queen Elizabeth or king Henry VIII.? What service did he do by his arms or counsels for the Protestant religion, or for the liberties or tranquillity of Europe? When his majesty's affairs were in the greatest distress, what credit had he abroad? or where was the foreign prince (except his own son-in law) that would lend him either men or money? If the Protestant religion was advanced in speculation by the writings of archbishop Land and Chillingworth; is it not sufficiently evident that the

Roman Catholics were prodigiously increased in numbers, reputation, and influence? Upon the whole, the people of England were so far from enjoying a full measure of felicity, that they groaned under a yoke of the heaviest oppression, and were prepared to lay hold of any opportunity to assert their liberties; so that to make his lordship's representation of the times consistent with truth, or with his own behaviour in the beginning of the long parliament, one is almost tempted to suspect it must have received some amendments or colourings from the hands of his editors. This was the state of affairs at the end of the pacific part of this reign, and forwards to the beginning of the long parliament.

CHAP. VI.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE COMMOTIONS IN SCOTLAND, TO THE LONG PARLIAMENT IN THE YEAR 1640.

We are now entering upon a scene of calamity which opened in the north, and in a few years, like a rising tempest, overspread both kingdoms, and involved them in all the miseries of a civil war. If archbishop Laud could have been content with being metropolitan of the church of England alone, he might have gone to his grave in peace; but grasping at the jurisdiction of another church founded upon different principles, he pulled both down upon his head and was buried in the ruins.

We have mentioned the preposterous publishing the Scots book of canons a year before their liturgy, which was not finished till the month of October 1636. His majesty's reasons for compiling it were, that "his royal father had intended it, and made a considerable progress in the work, in order to curb such of his subjects in Scotland as were inclined to Puritanism; that his present majesty resolved to pursue the same design, and therefore consented to the publication of this book, which was in substance the same with the English liturgy, that the Roman party might not upbraid us with any material differences, and yet it was so far distinct, that it might be truly reputed a book of that

church's composing, and established by his royal authority as king of Scotland."*

The compilers of this liturgy were chiefly Dr. Wederburne, a Scots divine, beneficed in England, but now bishop of Dunblain; and Dr. Maxwell, bishop of Ross. Their instructions from England were to keep such Catholic saints in their calendar as were in the English, and that such new saints as were added should be the most approved, but in no case to omit St. George and St. Patrick; that in the book of orders, those words in the English book be not changed, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" and that sundry lessons out of the Apocrypha be inserted; besides these, the word presbyter was inserted instead of priest; and the water in the font for baptism was to be consecrated. There was a benediction or thanksgiving for departed saints; some passages in the communion were altered in favour of the real presence; the rubrics contained instructions to the people, when to stand and when to sit or kneel: to all which the Scots had hitherto been strangers. The main parts of the liturgy were the same with the English, that there might be an appearance of uniformity; it was revised, corrected, and altered, by archbishop Laud and bishop Wren, as appeared by the original found in the archbishop's chamber in the Tower, in which the alterations were inserted with his own hand.

The liturgy, thus modelled, was sent into Scotland, with a royal proclamation, dated December 20, 1636, commanding all his majesty's loving subjects of that kingdom to receive it with reverence, as the only form his majesty thinks fit to be used in that kirk, without so much as laying it before a convocation, synod, general assembly, or parliament, of that nation. It was appointed to be read first on Easter Sunday 1637, against which time all parishes were to be provided with two books at least; but the outcries of the people against it were so vehement, that it was thought advisable to delay it to the 23d of July, that the lords of the session [or judges] might see the success of it before the end of the term, which always ends the 1st of August, in order to report in their several counties the peaceable receiving the book at Edinburgh and parts adjacent. The archbishop of St. Andrew's, with some of his more prudent

* Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 306.

brethren, foreseeing the disorders that would arise, advised the deferring it yet longer: but archbishop Laud was so sanguine of success, that he procured a warrant from the king, commanding the Scots bishops to go forward at all events, threatening that if they moved heavily, or threw in unnecessary delays, the king would remove them, and fill their sees with churchmen of more zeal and resolution.*

In obedience therefore to the royal command, notice having been given in all the pulpits of Edinburgh, that the Sunday following [July 23, 1637] the new service-book would be read in all the churches, there was a vast concourse of people at St. Giles's or the great church, where both the archbishops and divers bishops, together with the lords of the session, the magistrates of Edinburgh, and many of the council, were assembled; but as soon as the dean began to read, the service was interrupted by clapping of hands, and a hideous noise among the meaner sort of people at the lower end of the church; which the bishop of Edinburgh observing, stepped into the pulpit, and endeavoured to quiet them, but the disturbance increasing, a stool was thrown towards the desk; upon which the provost and bailiffs of the city came from their places, and with much difficulty thrust out the populace, and shut the church-doors; yet such were the clamours from without, rapping at the doors, and throwing stones at the windows, that it was with much difficulty the dean went through with the service: and when he and the bishop came out of church in their habits, they were in danger of being torn in pieces by the mob, who followed them, crying out, "Pull them down, a pape, a pape, antichrist," &c.

Between the two sermons the magistrates took proper measures for keeping the peace in the afternoon, but after evening-prayer the tumult was greater than in the morning; for the earl of Roxburgh returning to his lodgings with the

* "This (says Dr. Grey) is not very likely, and as he [i. e. Mr. Neal] produces no vouchers for what he says, he cannot reasonably take it amiss, if we do not readily assent to it." To this it is sufficient to reply, that the fact is stated by Collyer in his Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2. p. 770, whose words Mr. Neal uses. The eagerness of Laud to carry this point was stimulated by the earl of Traquair, who carried a letter to him from some of the lately preferred Scotch bishops, who had an overbalance of heat and spirits, urging execution and dispatch in the business. In this instance the archbishop was the dupe of the insidious policy of the earl of Traquair, whose aim was, by pushing things to extremity, to ruin the older Scotch bishops; who, as he thought, stood in the way of his ambitious views, and "might grow too big for his interest."—Ed.

bishop in his coach, was so pelted with stones, and pressed upon by the multitude, that both were in danger of their lives. The clergy who read the liturgy in the other churches met with the like usage, insomuch that the whole city was in an uproar, though it did not yet appear that any besides the meaner people were concerned in it;* however, the lords of the council thought proper to dispense with reading the service next Sunday, till their express returned from England with farther instructions, which Laud dispatched with all expedition, telling them, it was the king's firm resolution that they should go on with their work; and blaming them highly for suspending it.

Among the ministers who opposed reading the liturgy were, the reverend Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Rollock, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Hamilton, and Mr. Bruce, who were charged with letters of horning for their disobedience. But they stood by what they had done, and in their petition to the council gave the following reasons for their conduct; "(1.) Because the service-book had not been warranted by a general assembly, which is the representative body of the kirk, nor by any act of parliament. (2.) Because the liberties of the Scots kirk, and the form of worship received at the Reformation, and universally practised, stood still warranted by acts of the general assembly, and acts of parliament. (3.) Because the kirk of Scotland is a free and independent kirk, and therefore her own pastors are the proper judges what is most for her benefit. (4.) Some of the ceremonies contained in this book have occasioned great divisions in the kirk, forasmuch as they are inconsistent with the form of worship practised in it, and symbolize with the kirk of Rome, which is antichristian. (5.) Because the people, having been otherwise taught, are unwilling to receive the new book till they are better convinced." These reasons were of weight with the council, but they durst not shew favour to the prisoners without allowance from England, which could not be obtained; the zealous archbishop stopping his ears against all gentle methods of accommodation, hoping to bear down all opposition with the royal authority.

While the country people were busy at harvest, things were pretty quiet, but when that was over they came to Edinburgh in great numbers, and raised new disturbances,

* Rushworth's Collection, vol. 2. p. 389.

upon which the council issued out three proclamations; one for the people that came out of the country to return home; a second for removing the session or term from Edinburgh to Linlithgow; and a third, for calling in and burning a seditious pamphlet, called a "Discourse against the English Popish ceremonies, obtruded on the kirk of Scotland;"* all dated October 17, 1637. These proclamations inflamed the people to such a degree, that the very next day, the bishop of Galloway would have been torn in pieces by the mob, as he was going to the council-house, if he had not been rescued by Mr. Steward; but missing of his lordship they beset the council-house, and threatened to break open the door; insomuch that the lords who were assembled, were obliged to send for some of the popular nobility in town to their relief; however, the people would not disperse, till the council had promised to join with the other lords in petitioning the king against the service-book, and to restore the silenced ministers.

Soon after this, two petitions were presented to the lord-chancellor and council against the liturgy and canons; one in the name of all the men, women, children, and servants, of Edinburgh; and the other in the name of the noblemen, barons, gentry, ministers, and burgesses. Their objections against them were the same with those already mentioned. The petitions were transmitted to the king, who, instead of returning a soft answer, ordered a proclamation to be published from Stirling [Feb. 19, 1637], against the late disorderly tumults, in which, after having declared his abhorrence of all superstition and Popery, he expressed his displeasure against the petitioners; and, to prevent any farther riots, his majesty ordered the term or session to be removed from Linlithgow to Stirling,† twenty-four miles

* Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 400.

† "There is no order given in this proclamation (I will take upon me to say, having perused it carefully) for the removal of the session or term from Linlithgow to Stirling, as Mr. Neal affirms," says Dr. Grey. This is true, and Mr. Neal's inaccuracy here is in representing the removal of the session from Linlithgow to Stirling as directed by this proclamation; whereas it was the act of the council, after the earl of Roxburgh arrived in Scotland with certain instructions from the king to the council, who were to meet at Dalkeith, to consider of the disordered affairs of the kingdom. It should seem, that this removal was in consequence of those instructions; especially as the proclamation expressly inhibited the resort of the people to Stirling, "where (says his majesty) our council sits" without a warrant. Rushworth, vol. 2. part. 2. p. 760. Guthry, as quoted by Dr. Harris, expressly says, that the king's proclamation ordained that the council and no clans should remove from Edinburgh first to Lithgow, and afterward to Stirling. Life &c. of Charles I. p. 202.—Ed.

from Edinburgh, with a strict injunction that no stranger should resort thither without special licence. His majesty also forbade all assemblies or convocations of people to frame or sign petitions upon pain of high treason,* and yet declared at the same time that he would not shut his ears against them, if neither the form or matter were prejudicial to his royal authority.

Upon publishing this proclamation sundry noblemen, barons, ministers, and burghers, met together, and signed the following protest: "1. That it is the undoubted right of the subjects of Scotland, to have immediate recourse to the king by petition. 2. That archbishops and bishops ought not to sit in any judicatory in this kingdom, civil or ecclesiastical, till they have purged themselves of those crimes which are ready to be proved against them. 3. That no proclamation of council, in presence of the archbishops or bishops, shall be prejudicial to any of our proceedings. 4. That neither we nor any that adhere to us shall incur any damages for not observing the liturgy or book of canons, as long as it is not established by general assembly or act of parliament. 5. That if any inconvenience fall out (which God prevent) upon pressing the late innovations, we declare the same is not to be imputed to us. 6. That all our proceedings in this affair have no other tendency but the preservation of the true reformed religion, and the laws and liberties of the kingdom."

The council, being apprehensive of danger from these large assemblies and combinations of people, agreed, that if they would return peaceably to their houses, they might appoint some of their number of all ranks and orders to represent the rest, till his majesty's pleasure concerning their protest should be farther known.† Accordingly four tables, as they were called, were erected at Edinburgh; one of the nobility, another of the gentry, a third of the burroughs, and a fourth of the ministers. These prepared and digested matters for the general table, formed of commissioners from the other four, where the last and binding resolutions were taken.

One of the first things concluded upon by the tables, was the renewing their confession of faith, and the solemn league and covenant, subscribed by king James and his

* Rushworth, vol. 2 part. 2. p. 741, 742. † Ibid. vol. 1. part . p. 734

royal household, March 2, 1580—1, and by the whole Scots nation in the year 1590, with a general band for maintenance of true religion and the king's person. To this covenant was now added a narrative of sundry acts of parliament, by which the reformed religion had been ratified since that time, with an admonition, wherein the late innovations were renounced, and a band of defence for adhering to each other in the present cause.*

In their covenant they declare in the most solemn manner, "that they believe with their hearts, confess with their mouths, and subscribe with their hands, that the confession of faith then established by act of parliament, is the true Christian faith and religion, and the only ground of their salvation.—They farther declare their abhorrence of all kinds of Papistry in general, and then enumerate sundry particulars of Popish doctrine, discipline, and ceremonies, as the pope's pretended primacy over the Christian church; his five bastard sacraments, the doctrine of transubstantiation,—the mass, purgatory,—prayers for the dead, and in an unknown language,—justification by works,—auricular confession,—crosses, images, altars, dedicating of kirks, with all other rites, signs, and traditions, brought into the kirk without or contrary to the word of God. All which they promise to oppose to the utmost of their power, and to defend the ancient doctrine and discipline of their kirk all the days of their lives, under the pains contained in the law, and danger both of body and soul, in the day of God's fearful judgment, protesting and calling the Searcher of all hearts to witness, that their minds and hearts do fully agree with this their confession, promises, oath, and subscriptions. They protest and promise, under the same oath, hand-writing, and pains, to defend the king's royal person and authority with their goods, bodies, and lives, in defence of Christ's gospel, the liberties of their country, the administration of justice, and punishment of iniquity, against all his enemies within the realm and without; and this they do from their very hearts, as they hope God will be their defence in the day of death, and the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. To whom with the Father and Holy Spirit, be all honour and glory eternally."

Then follows a recital of the acts of parliament, by which the reformed religion was established among them. But

* Nalson's Collection, p. 20.

instead of the band of defence annexed to the covenant of 1580, they framed a new one, suited to the present time, in which, after reciting the king's coronation-oath, they declare, "that as they will defend the king's royal person and authority, they will also support the authority of parliaments, upon which the security of the lands, livings, rights, and properties, depend, and without which neither any law nor lawful judicatory can be established. They declare the late innovations brought into the kirk to be contrary to the doctrine and discipline of it, and contrary to the covenant above mentioned, and therefore they will forbear the practice of them till they are tried, and allowed in a free assembly, and in parliament; and not only so, but they promise and swear, by the great name of God, to resist all these errors and corruptions to the utmost of their power, all the days of their lives. They then promise and swear over again, to defend the king's person and authority in the preservation of the aforesaid true religion, laws, and liberties, of the kingdom, and to assist and stand by one another at all adventures, without suffering themselves to be divided by any allurement or terror from this blessed and loyal conjunction, and without being afraid of the odious aspersions of rebellion, or combination, which their adversaries may cast upon them. And they conclude with calling the Searcher of hearts to witness to their sincerity, as they shall answer it to Christ in the day of account, and under pain of the loss of all honours and respect in this world, and God's everlasting wrath in the next." All this was sworn to and subscribed with great seriousness and devotion, first at Edinburgh, in the month of February 1637—8, and afterward in the several counties and shires, where it was received by the common people, as a sacred oracle, and subscribed by all such as were thought to have any zeal for the Protestant religion, and the liberties of their country. The privy-counsellors, the judges, the bishops, and the friends of arbitrary power, were the principal persons who refused. The universities of St. Andrew and Aberdeen were said to oppose it, and those of Glasgow did not subscribe without some limitations.

There cannot be a more solemn and awful engagement to God, and each other than this! what the reasons were that induced king James, and the whole Scots nation, to

enter into it in the years 1580 and 1590, are not necessary to be determined; but certainly such a combination of subjects, without the consent of their sovereign, in a well-settled government, is unwarrantable, especially when it is confirmed with an oath, as no oath ought to be administered but by commission from the chief magistrate. The only foundation therefore upon which this covenant can be vindicated is, that the Scots apprehended their legal church-establishment had been broken in pieces by the king's assuming the supremacy, by his erecting a high-commission, and by his imposing upon them a book of canons and liturgy, without consent of parliament or general assembly.

The council sent advice of the proceedings of the covenanters from time to time, and acquainted his majesty, that the cause of all the commotions was the fear of innovations in the doctrine and discipline of the kirk, by introducing the liturgy, canons, and high-commission; that it was therefore their humble opinion, that the reading the service-book should not be urged at present. Upon this the king sent the marquis of Hamilton, his high-commissioner, into Scotland, with instructions to consent to the suspending the use of the service-book for the present, but at the same time to dissolve the tables, and to require the covenant to be delivered up within six weeks. His majesty adds, "that if there be not sufficient strength in the kingdom to oblige the covenanters to return to their duty, he will come in person from England at the head of a sufficient power to force them;" and in the meantime, the marquis is empowered to use all hostile acts against them as a rebellious people.

Upon the marquis's arrival at Holyrood-house, he was welcomed by great numbers of the covenanters of all ranks and qualities, in hopes that he would call a general assembly and a free parliament; but when he told them this was not in his instructions, they went home full of resentments. The people nailed up the organ-loft in the church, and admonished the marquis not to read the liturgy. The ministers cautioned their hearers against consenting to ensnaring propositions; and a letter was sent to the marquis and council, exhorting them to subscribe the covenant. His lordship sent advice of these things to court, and moved his majesty either to yield to the people, or hasten his royal

arms. The king replied that he would rather die than yield to their impertinent and damnable demands; but admitted of the marquis's flattering them to gain time,* provided he did not consent to the calling a general assembly or parliament, till they had disavowed or given up the covenant.† When this was known, both ministers and people declared with one voice, that they would as soon renounce their baptism as their covenant; but withal avowed their duty and allegiance to the king, and their resolutions to stand by his majesty, in defence of the true religion, laws, and liberties, of the kingdom. The marquis, not being able to make any impression on the covenanters, returned to England with an account of the melancholy state of affairs in that kingdom, which surprised the English court, and reflected some disgrace upon the archbishop, for as his grace was going to council, Archibald, the king's jester, said to him, "Whae's feule now? Does not your grace hear the news from Striveling about the liturgy?"‡ His grace complaining of this usage to the council, Archibald Armstrong, the king's fool, was ordered to have his coat pulled over his ears, to be discharged the king's service, and banished the court.

After some time Hamilton was sent back with instructions (if necessity required) to revoke the liturgy, the canons, the high-commission, and the five articles of Perth; and with authority to subscribe the confession of faith of 1580, with the band thereunto annexed, and to take orders that all his majesty's subjects subscribed the same.§ He might also promise the calling a general assembly and parliament within a competent time, but was to endeavour to exclude the laity from the assembly. The design of subscribing the band of the old covenant of 1580, was to secure the continuance of episcopacy, because that band obliges them to maintain the religion at that time professed, which the king

* Dr. Grey would supply from the original, "by all the honest means you can, without forsaking your ground."—Ed.

† Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 752. 762.

‡ On the stool being thrown at the dean's head, who first read it in the cathedral at Edinburgh, Archy said, it was "the stool of repentance." He had a particular spleen against bishop Laud, and the gravity of history will be relieved by another stroke of his humour pointed at this prelate. Once, when the bishop was present, he asked leave to say grace, which being granted him, he said, "Great praise be given to God, and little Laud to the devil." Granger's Biog. History, vol. 2. p. 100.—Ed.

§ Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 707, &c.

would interpret of prelatical government, as being no then legally discharged by parliament, and because it contained no promise of mutual defence and assistance against all persons whatsoever, which might include the king himself. However, the covenanters did not think fit to subscribe over again, and therefore only thanked the king for discharging the liturgy, the canons, and high-commission.

At length the marquis published a proclamation for a general assembly to meet at Glasgow, November 21 [1638]. The choice of members went every where in favour of the covenanters, the reverend Mr. Henderson, one of the silenced ministers, was chosen moderator, and Mr. Johnston, clerk-register;* but the bishops presented a declinator, "declaring the assembly to be unlawful, and the members of it not qualified to represent the clergy of the nation, (1.) Because they were chosen before the presbyteries had received the royal mandate to make election. (2.) Because most of them had not subscribed the articles of religion, nor sworn to the king's supremacy in presence of the bishops, for neglect of which they were *ipso facto* deprived. (3.) Because they had excluded the bishops, who, by the act of assembly at Glasgow 1610, were to be perpetual moderators. (4.) Because there were lay-elders among them who had no right to be there, nor had ordinarily sat in presbyteries for above forty years. (5.) Because they apprehended it absurd, as well as contrary to the practice of the Christian church, that archbishops and bishops should be judged by a mixed assembly of clergy and laics." Signed by the archbishop of St. Andrews, the bishops of Glasgow, Edinburgh, Galloway, Ross, and Brechin.

The force of these objections, how strong soever in themselves, was taken off by the king's owning the assembly, and sitting in it by his commissioner seven days; though at the dissolution he declared their proceedings to be utterly destructive of the name and nature of a free assembly.

The bishops' declinator being read, was unanimously rejected, and a committee appointed to draw up an answer. In the meantime the assembly was busy in examining elections, in which the covenanters carried every thing before them; the marquis therefore, despairing of any good issue, determined, according to his instructions, to dissolve

* Rushworth, p. 865—867.

them; and accordingly went to the great church where they sat, and read over his majesty's concessions; as, (1.) "That his majesty was willing to discharge the service-book, and the book of canons. (2.) To dissolve the high-commission. (3.) That the articles of Perth should not be urged. (4.) That no oath should be required of any minister at his entrance into the ministry, but what is required by act of parliament. (5.) That for the future there should be general assemblies as often as the affairs of the kirk shall require; and that the bishops should be censurable by the assembly, according to their merits. (6.) That the confession of faith of 1580, should be subscribed by all his majesty's subjects of Scotland." These, although very considerable abatements, did not reach the requirements of the covenanters, which were, the dissolution of the order of the bishops, and of the above-mentioned grievances by a statute law. The marquis went on, and in a long speech declaimed against lay-elders, "an office (as he said) unknown in the church for fifteen hundred years, such persons being very unfit to judge of the high mysteries of predestination, effectual grace, anti and post lapsarian doctrines, or to pass sentence upon their superiors in learning and office." He therefore advised them to break up and choose another assembly of all clergymen; but his motion striking at the very being and lawfulness of their present constitution, was unanimously rejected; whereupon the marquis dissolved them, after they had sat only seven days: forbidding them to continue their sessions upon pain of high treason; and next morning the dissolution was published by proclamation at the market-cross.

But the assembly, instead of submitting to the royal command, continued sitting, and the very next day [November 29] published a protestation to justify their proceedings, wherein they affirm, "1. That ruling elders have constantly sat in their assemblies before the late times of corruption. 2. That his majesty's presence in their assemblies, either in his own person or by his commissioners, is not for voting, but as princes and emperors of old, in a princely manner, to countenance their meetings, and preside in them for external order. 3. That it is clear, by the doctrine and discipline of the kirk, contained in the book of

policy, and registered in the book of the assembly, and subscribed by the presbyteries of this kirk, that it is unlawful in itself, and prejudicial to the privileges that Christ has left his church, for the king to dissolve or break up the assembly of this kirk, or to stay their proceedings; for then it would follow, that religion and church-government should depend absolutely upon the pleasure of the prince. 4. That there is no pretence by act of assembly, or parliament, or any preceding practice, whereby the king's majesty, or his commissioner, may lawfully dissolve the general assembly of the church of Scotland, without their consent. 5. That the assemblies of the kirk have continued sitting, notwithstanding any contramand, as it is evident by all the records thereof; and in particular, by the general assembly of 1582. And, lastly, to dissolve the assembly before any grievances are redressed, is to throw back the whole nation into confusion, and to make every man despair hereafter ever to see innovations removed, the subjects' complaints regarded, or offenders punished. For these reasons they declare it lawful and necessary to continue the present assembly, till they have tried and censured all the by-gone evils and the introductors of them, and have provided a solid course for continuing God's truth in this land with purity and liberty; they declare farther, that the said assembly is and shall be esteemed and obeyed as a most lawful, full, and free, general assembly of this kingdom, and that the acts, sentences, censures, and proceedings, of it, shall be obeyed and observed by all the subjects of this kingdom."*

Archbishop Laud was vexed at these bold and desperate proceedings of the assembly, and thought of nothing but dispersing them by arms. "I will be bold to say (says his grace), never were there more gross absurdities, nor half so many, in so short a time committed in any public meeting; and for a national assembly, never did the church of Christ see the like." "——I am as sorry as your grace [the marquis of Hamilton] can be, that the king's preparations can make no more haste; I hope you think I have called upon his majesty, and by his command upon some others, to hasten all that may be, and more than this I cannot do;—I have done, and do daily call upon his majesty for his preparations;

* Rushworth, vol. i. part 2. p. 863 -865.

he protests he makes all the haste he can, and I believe him, but the jealousies of giving the covenanters umbrage too soon have made preparations here so late."

The assembly, according to their resolution, continued sitting several weeks, till they had passed the following acts; an act for disannulling six late assemblies therein mentioned, held in the years 1606, 1608, 1610, 1616, 1617, 1618, with the reasons; an act for abjuring and abolishing episcopacy; an act for condemning the five articles of Perth; an act for condemning the service-book, book of canons, book of ordination, and the high-commission; an act for condemning archdeacons, chapters, and preaching deacons; an act for restoring presbyteries, provincial and national assemblies, to their constitution of ministers and elders, and to their power and jurisdiction contained in the book of policy;* with many others of the like nature. They then pronounced sentence of deposition against the bishops; eight of whom were excommunicated; four excluded from the ministerial function, and two only allowed to officiate as pastors or presbyters. Upon this Dr. Spotswood, bishop of St. Andrews, and lord-high-chancellor of Scotland, retired to London, where he died the next year. Most of his brethren the bishops took the same method, only four remained in the country, three of whom renounced their episcopal orders, viz. Alexander Ramsey bishop of Dunkeld, George Graham bishop of Orkney, and James Fairby bishop of Argyle; but the fourth, George Guthrey, bishop of Murray, kept his ground and weathered the storm. At the close of the session the assembly drew up a letter to the king, complaining of his majesty's commissioner, who had proclaimed them traitors, and forbade the people to pay any regard to their acts; and praying the king to look upon them still as his good and faithful subjects. They also published another declaration to the good people of England, in vindication of their proceedings, which his majesty took care to suppress, and issued out a proclamation against the seditious behaviour of the covenanters, which he commanded to be read in all the churches in England.†

It was easy to foresee that these warm proceedings must issue in a war, especially when it is remembered that his majesty consulted with none but the declared enemies of their

* Rushworth, vol. 1 part 2. p. 874. † Ibid. p. 876.

kirk, viz. Laud, Hamilton, and Wentworth. On the 26th of January the king published his resolution to go in person against the Scots covenanters at the head of an army; for this purpose the nobility were summoned to attend his majesty, and all the wheels of the prerogative were put in motion to raise men and money.* Dr. Pierce, bishop of Bath and Wells, in his letter to his clergy, calls it "bellum episcopale," a war for the support of episcopacy, that they should therefore stir up their clergy to a liberal contribution after the rate of three shillings and tenpence in the pound, according to the valuation of their livings in the king's books. The archbishop also wrote to his commissary, sir John Lamb, for a contribution in the civil courts of Doctors'-commons, requiring him to send the names of such as refused to himself at Lambeth. The queen and her friends undertook for the Roman Catholics; the courtiers and the country gentlemen were applied to, to lend money upon this occasion, which the former readily complied with, but of the latter forty only contributed together about 1,100*l.* With these and some other assistances, the king fitted out a fleet of sixteen men-of-war, and raised a splendid army of twenty-one thousand horse and foot.

The Scots, being informed of the preparations that were making against them in England, secured the important castles of Edinburgh, Dumbritton, and Frith; and raised an army of such volunteers as had the cause of the kirk at heart, and were determined to sacrifice their lives in defence of it; they sent for their old general Lesley from Germany, who upon this occasion quitted the emperor's service, and brought over with him several experienced officers. But their greatest distress was the want of fire-arms, ammunition, and money, there not being above three thousand arms to be found in the whole kingdom; and having no money, their soldiers made such a ragged appearance, that when the king saw them, he said, "they would certainly fight the English if it were only to get their fine clothes." But the success of this war will fall within the compass of the next year.

To return to England, the star-chamber and high-commission went on with their oppressions, as if they were under no apprehensions from the storm that was gathering in

* Prynne's Introd. p. 177, 178. 196. Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 791.

the north. Many ministers were suspended and shut up in prison, as, Mr. Henry Wilkinson, B. D. of Magdalen-college, Oxford; Mr. George Walker, Mr. Smith, Mr. Small, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Brewer, a Baptist preacher, who lay in prison fourteen years; Mr. Foxley, of St. Martin's in the Fields, who was confined in a chamber in the Gate-house, not four yards square, for twenty months, without pen, ink, or paper, or the access of any friends, even in his extreme sickness; and all this without knowing his crime or so much as guessing at it, unless it was for speaking in favour of the feoffees.*

Great numbers of Puritans continued to flock into New England, notwithstanding the prohibition of the council last year, insomuch that the Massachusets-bay began to be too strait for them; in the latter end of the year 1636, about one hundred families travelled farther into the country, and settled on the banks of the river Connecticut, with the reverend Mr. Hooker at their head; another detachment went from Dorchester; a third from Water-Town; and a fourth from Roxbury; and built the towns of Hertford, Windsor, Wethersfield, and Springfield, in that colony. Next year [1637] the passengers from England were so numerous that they projected a new settlement on the south-west part of Connecticut-river, in a large bay near the confines of New York; the leaders of this colony were Theophilus Eaton, esq. and the reverend Mr. Davenport, who came from England with a large retinue of acquaintance and followers; they spread along the coast, and first built the town of New-haven, which gives name to the colony; and after some time the towns of Guilford, Milford, Stamford, Brentford, &c. Notwithstanding these detachments, the Massachusets-bay had such frequent recruits from England, that they were continually building new towns or enlarging their settlements in the neighbourhood.

Among the divines who went over this summer, was the reverend Mr. Ezekial Rogers, M. A. some time chaplain in the family of sir Francis Barrington of Hatfield Broad-oak in Essex, and afterward vicar of Rowley in Yorkshire, where he continued a successful preacher to a numerous congregation almost twenty years.† The archbishop of that diocess [Dr. Matthews] being a moderate divine, permitted the

* Prynne, p. 380. † Mather's History of New England, b. 3. p. 101.

use of those lectures or prophesyings which queen Elizabeth had put down; the ministers within certain districts had their monthly exercises, in which one or two preached and others prayed before a numerous and attentive audience. One of the hearers that bore an ill-will to the exercises, told the archbishop that the ministers prayed against him; but his grace, instead of giving credit to the informer, answered with a smile, that he could hardly believe him, because "those good men know (says he) that if I were gone to heaven, their exercises would soon be put down;" which came to pass accordingly, for no sooner was his successor [Mr. Neile] in his chair, but he put a period to them, and urged subscription with so much severity, that many of the clergy were suspended and silenced; among whom was Mr. Rogers, who, having no farther prospect of usefulness in his own country, embarked with several of his Yorkshire friends for New England, where he arrived in the summer of the year 1638, and settled at a place which he called Rowley. Here he spent the remainder of his days, amidst a variety of afflictions and sorrows till the year 1660, when he died in the seventieth year of his age.

Mr. Samuel Newman, author of that concordance of the Bible that bears his name, was born at Banbury, educated at Oxford, and having finished his studies, entered into holy orders, and became minister of a small living in that county; but the severe prosecutions of the spiritual courts obliged him to no less than seven removals, till at length he resolved to get out of their reach and remove with his friends to New England, where he arrived this summer, and settled at Rehoboth in the colony of New Plymouth, where he spent the remainder of his days to the year 1663, when he died in the sixty-third year of his age.* He was a hard student, a lively preacher, and of a heavenly conversation.

Mr. Charles Chauncey,† B. D. educated in Cambridge,

* Mather's Hist. p. 113.

† He received his grammar education at Westminster-school; and was at school at the time the gunpowder plot was to have taken effect; and must have perished, if it had succeeded. He was an accurate Hebrecian and Grecian, and admirably skilled in all the learned languages. Latin and Greek verses of his appeared in the collections of poetical compliments of condolence or congratulation, offered by the university on different occasions to the courts of James I. and Charles I. He was at Boston in order to take passage for England, in consequence of an invitation to settle again with his old people at Ware; when the importunities of the overseers of Harward-college prevailed with him to accept the presidentship of that seminary, in which place he continued highly honoured for his learning and piety. A grandson of his son

and Greek lecturer of his own college in that university. He was afterward settled at Ware, and was an admired and useful preacher, till he was driven from thence, as has been related. When the book of sports was published, and the drums beat about the town to summon the people to their dances and revels on the Lord's day evening, he preached against it, for which he was suspended, and soon after totally silenced.* Few suffered more for nonconformity, says my author, by fines, by imprisonment, and by necessities, than Mr. Chauncey; at length he determined to remove to New England, where he arrived in the year 1638, and became president of Harward-college in Cambridge. Here he continued a most learned, laborious, and useful governor, till the year 1671, when he died in the eighty-second year of his age; he left behind him six sons, the eldest of which was Dr. Isaac Chauncey, well known heretofore among the Nonconformist ministers of London.

I pass over the lives of many other divines and substantial gentlemen, who deserted their native country for the peace of their consciences; but it deserves a particular notice that there were eight sail of ships at once this spring in the river Thames bound for New England, and filled with Puritan families, among whom (if we may believe Dr. George Bates and Mr. Dugdale, two famous royalists) were, Oliver Cromwell, afterward protector of the commonwealth of England, John Hampden, esq. and Mr. Arthur Haselrigge, who, seeing no end of the oppressions of their native country, determined to spend the remainder of their days in America; but the council, being informed of their design, issued out an order dated May 1, 1638, to make stay of those ships, and to put on shore all the provisions intended for the voyage. And to prevent the like for the future, his majesty prohibited all masters and owners of ships, to set forth any ships for New England with passengers, without special licence from the privy-council; and gives this remarkable

Isaac, also named Charles, minister of the first church in Boston, died 10th of February 1787, in the eighty-third year of his age; having been an ornament to his profession, distinguished by his extensive benevolence and invincible integrity, a warm and virtuous patriot; for nearly *sixty years the able faithful instructor* and friend of his flock, and the author of many works, which remain monuments of his abilities, application, and excellent temper. The most valuable and laboured were, "The salvation of all men," a treatise; "Five dissertations on the fall and its consequences;" and a tract on the "Benevolence of the Deity;" all published in London. See Dr. Grey, and Clarke's funeral sermon for Dr. Charles Chauncey, 1787.—Ed.

* Mather's History of New England, p. 134.

reason for it, "Because the people of New England were factious and unworthy of any support from hence, in regard of the great disorders and want of government among them, whereby many that have been well affected to the church of England have been prejudiced in their estates by them."*

When the Puritans might not transport themselves to New England, they removed with their families into the Low Countries; among the divines who went thither about this time, were Dr. Thomas Goodwin, educated in Cambridge, and a great admirer of Dr. Preston. In the year 1628, he was chosen to preach the lecture in Trinity-church, and held it till the year 1634, when he left the university and all his preferments, through dissatisfaction with the terms of conformity: having lived in retirement till this time, he withdrew with some select friends to Holland, and settled at Arnheim in Gelderland, where he continued till the beginning of the long parliament.

Philip Nye, M. A. educated in Magdalen-hall, Oxon, and a popular preacher at St. Bartholomew exchange, London.

Mr. Jeremiah Burroughs, a most candid and moderate divine, educated in Cambridge, and afterward a famous preacher to two of the largest congregations about London, viz. Stepney and Cripplegate.

Mr. William Bridge, M. A. and fellow of Emanuel-college, Cambridge; he was first minister in Essex, and afterward settled in the city of Norwich, in the parish of St. George Tombland; where he continued till he was silenced for nonconformity by bishop Wren, in the year 1637, and excommunicated.

Mr. Sydrach Sympson, educated in Cambridge, and afterward a celebrated preacher in London. These were afterward the five pillars of the Independent or congregational party, and were distinguished by the name of the Dissenting Brethren in the assembly of divines.

Several gentlemen and merchants of figure disposed of their effects, and went after them into exile, as, sir Matthew Poynton, sir William Constable, sir Richard Saltington, Mr. Lawrence, afterward lord-president of the council, Mr. Andrews, afterward lord-mayor of London, Mr. Aske, since

* Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2 p. 4 9.

a judge, Mr. Bouchier, Mr. James, Mr. White, and others. The States received them with great humanity, granting them the use of their churches at different hours of the day, with the liberty of ringing a bell for public worship, though they did not approve of the Dutch discipline, or join in communion with their churches.

Great was the damage the nation sustained by these removals: Heylin observes,* "The severe pressing of the ceremonies made the people in many trading towns tremble at a visitation, but when they found their striving in vain, and that they had lost the comfort of the lecturers, who were turned out for not reading the second service at the communion-table in their hoods and surplices, and for using other prayers besides that of the fifty-fifth canon, it was no hard matter for those ministers to persuade them to transport themselves into foreign parts; "The sun (said they) shines as comfortably in other places, and the Sun of righteousness much brighter; it is better to go and dwell in Goshen, find it where we can, than tarry in the midst of such Egyptian bondage as is among us; the sinful corruptions of the church are now grown so general, that there is no place free from the contagion; therefore, 'go out of her my people, and be not partakers of her sins.'" And hereunto they were encouraged by the Dutch, who chose rather to carry their manufactures home, than be obliged to resort to their parish-churches, as by the archbishop's injunctions they were obliged.

The eyes of all England were now towards the north, whither the king went March 27, to put himself at the head of his army raised against the Scots; the earls of Arundel, Essex, and Holland, being the chief commanding officers under his majesty. The Scots, under the command of general Leslie, received them upon the borders; but when the two armies had faced each other for some time, the king, perceiving that his Protestant nobility and soldiers were not hearty in his cause, gave way to a treaty at the petition of the Scots, which ended in a pacification June 17, by which all points of difference were referred to a general assembly to be held at Edinburgh, August 12, and to a parliament which was to meet about a fortnight after. In the mean-

* Life of Laud, p. 307.

time both armies were to be disbanded,* the tables to be broken up, and no meetings held except such as are warranted by act of parliament. Accordingly the king dismissed his army, but with very disobliging circumstances, not giving the nobility and gentry so much as thanks for their affection, loyalty, and personal attendance, which they resented so highly, that few or none of them appeared upon the next summons; the Scots delivered back the king's forts and castles into his majesty's hands, and disbanded the soldiery, wisely keeping their officers in pay till they saw the effect of the pacification.†

The general assembly met at Edinburgh according to the treaty, but being of the same constitution with the last, the bishops presented another declinator to his majesty's commissioner [the earl of Traquair], and were excused giving their attendence by express letter from the king, his majesty in his instructions to his commissioner having yielded them the point of lay-elders. The assembly, therefore, without any opposition, confirmed the proceedings of that at Glasgow, which was of very dubious authority. They appointed the covenant to be taken throughout the kingdom, and explained the bond of mutual defence to a consistency with their late conduct. They voted away the new service-book, the book of canons, the five articles of Perth, the high-commission, and with one consent determined, that diocesan episcopacy was unlawful, and not to be allowed in their kirk.‡ This the earl of Traquair did not apprehend inconsistent with his private instructions from the king, which were these: "We allow episcopacy to be abolished for the reasons contained in the articles, and that the covenant of

* Dr. Grey quotes lord Clarendon, as stating "that the king's army, by the very words of the agreement, was not to be disbanded, until all should be executed on the part of the Scots." But not to say, that the accounts of this treaty in the Memoirs of the Marquis of Hamilton, p. 142, and in Guthry, as quoted by Dr. Harris, p. 988, mention no such limitation; lord Clarendon himself undermines his own authority on this matter, by telling his reader, that "no two who were present at the treaty agreed in the same relation of what was said or done; and, which was worse, not in the same interpretation of the meaning of what was comprehended in writing." Clarendon's History, vol. 1. p. 123. Ed.

† Mrs. Macaulay, in her detail of this treaty, mentions as a memorable circumstance, unnoticed by historians, and very expressive of the pacific disposition of the Scots, that they told the king, that if he would give them leave to enjoy their religion and their laws, they would, at their own expense, transport their army to assist the restorer of the Palatinate. History of England, vol. 2. p. 283, note, 8vo. edition.

‡ Baillie Collection, p. 246, 247.

1580, for satisfaction of our people, be subscribed.—Again, if they require episcopacy to be abjured, as contrary to the constitution of the church of Scotland, you are to give way to it, but not as a point of Popery, or as contrary to God's law, or the Protestant religion.—Again, in giving way to the abolishing episcopacy, be careful that it be done without the appearing of any warrant from the bishops in prejudice of episcopacy as unlawful; but only in satisfaction to the people for settling the present disorders, and such other reasons of state; but herein you must be careful that our intentions appear not to any." It is evident from hence, that his majesty's usage of the Scots was neither frank nor sincere; he had no design to abolish episcopacy, and only consented to suspend it, because he was told that the bishops being one of the three estates of parliament, no law made in their absence could be of force, much less an act for abolishing their whole order, after they had entered their protest in form. When his majesty gave way to the subscribing the covenant, it was with another reserve, "as far as may stand with our future intentions well known to you. For though we have discharged the service-book and canons, we will never consent that they be condemned as Popish and superstitious,*—nor will we acknowledge that the high-commission was without law, nor that the five articles of Perth be condemned as contrary to the confession of faith; it is enough that they be laid aside." His majesty's instructions conclude, "that if any thing be yielded in the present assembly prejudicial to his majesty's service, his commissioner shall protest, that his majesty may be heard for redress thereof in his own time and place."

The Scots parliament met Aug. 31 [1639], and having first subscribed the solemn league and covenant with the king's consent, they confirmed all the acts of the general assembly, concluding with the utter extirpation of episcopacy as unlawful.† But the king having by letter to his commissioner forbidden him to consent to the word unlawful, lest it should be interpreted absolutely, though it seems to have a reference only to the kirk of Scotland, his lordship prorogued the parliament, first for fourteen days, and then, by the king's express command,‡ for nine months, without

* Nelson's Collection, p. 254, 255. † Ibid. p. 256.

‡ The term of prorogation, as Dr. Grey points it out, is expressed in Nelson thus—"till the next spring." Ibid.

ratifying any of their acts. The earl of Dunfermlin and lord Loudon were dispatched to London, to beseech his majesty to consent to their ratification; but they were sent back with a reprimand for their misbehaviour, being hardly admitted into the king's presence. It seems too apparent, that his majesty meant little or nothing by his concessions but to gain time; for in his declaration before the next war, about six months forward, he says, "Concerning our promise of a free parliament, no man can imagine we intended it should be so free as not to be limited by the enjoyment of their religion and liberties, according to the ecclesiastical and civil laws of that kingdom; but if they pass these bounds, we are disobliged, and they left at liberty to fly at our monarchial government without control, to wrest the sceptre out of our hands, and to rob the crown of the fairest flower belonging to it."* The king, therefore, did not really intend the alteration of any of the civil or ecclesiastical laws of that kingdom, and by his majesty's not ratifying any of their acts, it was evident, that the English court had resumed their courage, and were determined once more to try the fortune of war.

In the meantime, to balance the declaration of the Scots assembly, bishop Hall, at the request of Laud, composed a treatise of the "Divine right of episcopacy," which the archbishop revised. The propositions which he advances are these: (1.) That form of government which is of apostolical institution ought to be esteemed of divine right. (2.) That form which was practised and recommended by the apostles, though not expressly commanded, is of apostolical institution. (3.) The government set up by the apostles was designed for perpetuity. (4.) The universal practice of the primitive church is the best rule to judge of the apostolical practice. (5.) We ought not to suppose the primitive fathers would change the form of government they had received from the apostles. (6.) The accession of privilege and honourable titles does not affect the substance of the episcopal function. (7.) The Presbyterian government, though challenging the glorious title of Christ's kingdom and ordinance, has no foundation in Scripture, or in the practice of the church for fifteen hundred years, and is altogether incongruous and unjustifiable.

* Nalson's Collection, p. 771.

The bishop's book was altered in many places, contrary to his own inclinations, by the archbishop, and particularly in those wherein he had called the pope antichrist, or spoke too favourably of the morality of the sabbath; and said, that presbytery was of use, where episcopacy could not be obtained. His grace disapproved of his lordship's waiving the question, whether episcopacy was a distinct order, or only a higher degree of the same order; and of his advancing the divine right of episcopacy no higher than the apostles, whereas he would have it derived from Christ himself. Upon the whole, his lordship's book was so modelled by his metropolitan, that in the debate hereafter mentioned, he could hardly go the lengths of his own performance.

The bishops still kept a strict hand over the Puritans: not a sermon was to be heard on the distinguishing points of Calvinism all over England. In some diocesses great complaints were made of Puritan justices of peace, for being too strict in putting the laws in execution against profaneness. At Ashford in Kent the archbishop said, he must have recourse to the statute of abjuration, and call in the assistance of the temporal courts to reduce the separatists, the censures of the church not being sufficient. Upon the whole, there was no abatement of the height of conformity, even to the end of this year, though the flames that were kindling in Scotland began to disturb the tranquillity of the church.

Mr. Bagshaw, a lawyer of some standing in the Middle Temple, being chosen reader in that house for the Lent vacation, began to attack the power of the bishops. In his lectures on the 25th Edw. III. cap. 7, he maintained that acts of parliament were valid without the assent of the lords spiritual. 2. That no beneficed clerk was capable of temporal jurisdiction at the making that law. And, 3. That no bishop, without calling a synod, had power as a diocesan to convict a heretic. Laud, being informed of these positions, told the king that Bagshaw had justified the Scots covenanters in decrying the temporal jurisdiction of churchmen, and the undoubted right of the bishops to their seats in parliament; upon which he was immediately interdicted all farther reading on those points; and though Bagshaw humbly petitioned the lord keeper and the archbishop for liberty to proceed, he could get no other answer, after long

attendance, than that it had been better for him not to have meddled with that argument, which should stick closer to him than he was aware of.* Whereupon he retired into the country.

The resolution of the English court to renew the war with Scotland, was owing to the lord-deputy Wentworth, whom archbishop Laud had sent for from Ireland for this purpose. This nobleman, from being an eminent patriot, was become a petty tyrant, and had governed Ireland in a most arbitrary and sovereign manner for about seven years, discountenancing the Protestants, because they were Calvinists, and inclined to Puritanism, and giving all imaginable encouragement to the Roman Catholics as friends to the prerogative, whereby he suffered the balance of power in that kingdom to fall into the hands of the Papists. Wentworth, being come to court, was immediately created earl of Strafford and knight of the garter, and in concert with Laud advised the king to set aside the pacification, and to push the Scots war with vigour, offering his majesty eight thousand Irish, and a large sum of money for his assistance; but this not being sufficient, the war was thought so reasonable and necessary to the king's honour, that it might be ventured with an English parliament, which being laid before the council, was cheerfully agreed to, and, after twelve years' interval, a parliament was summoned to meet April 13, 1640.

The Scots foreseeing the impending storm, consulted where to fly for succour; some were for throwing themselves into the hands of the French, and accordingly wrote a very submissive letter to that monarch, signed by the hands of seven Scots peers, but never sent it; for upon application to their friends at London, they were assured by a letter drawn up by lord Saville, and signed by himself, with the names of Bedford, Essex, Brook, Warwick, Say and Seal, and Mandeville (who agreed to the letter, though they were so cautious as not to write their own names), "that the hearts of the people of England were with them; that they were convinced, the liberties of both nations were at stake, and therefore they might depend upon their assistance as soon as a fair opportunity offered." Upon this encouragement the Scots laid aside their design of applying to

* Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 407.

France, and resolved to raise another army from among themselves, and march into England.

"The parliament that met at Westminster (says the noble historian*) was made up of sober and dispassionate men, exceedingly disposed to do the king service," and yet his majesty would not condescend to speak to them from the throne,† ordering the lord-keeper Finch to acquaint them with the undutiful behaviour of the Scots, whom he was determined to reduce, and therefore would not admit of the mediation of the two houses, but expected their immediate assistance, after which he would give them time to consider of any just grievances to be redressed. But the commons, instead of beginning with the supply, appointed committees for religion and grievances, which disobliged the king so much, that, after several fruitless attempts to persuade them to begin with the subsidy-bill, he dissolved them in anger, without passing a single act, after they had sat about three weeks. The blame of this hasty dissolution was by some cast upon Laud, by others on sir Harry Vane, while the king laid it on the misbehaviour of the house of commons, who would not take his royal word for redress of grievances, after they had voted the necessary supplies; he therefore sent the leading members of the house into custody, and committed them prisoners to the Fleet and other prisons.

His majesty having failed of a parliamentary supply at the time he demanded it, was told by lord Strafford and others of the council, that he was now absolved from all rules of government, and might take what his necessities required, and his power could obtain. This indeed was no more than his majesty had been doing for twelve years before; but some people drew an unhappy conclusion from this maxim, viz. that if the king was absolved from all

* Clarendon's Hist. vol. 1. p. 139.

† Lord Clarendon says, "After the king had shortly mentioned his desire to be again acquainted with parliaments after so long an intermission, &c." he referred the cause to be enlarged on by the speaker. "It is plain from hence (Dr. Grey adds) that his majesty did condescend to speak to them from the throne." This is observed to impeach Mr. Neal's veracity. But when the reader has him before him the short speech delivered from the throne, he will judge whether Mr. Neal stands charged with more than an inaccuracy. It is given us by Nalson, vol. 1. p. 806.

"My lords and gentlemen,

"There never was a king that had a more great and weighty cause to call his people together than myself; I will not trouble you with the particulars. I have informed my lord-keeper, and command him to speak, and to desire your attention." This was not properly a speech from the throne, but, as Mrs. Macaulay calls it, "a short preface" to the lord-keeper's speech. Vo.

rules of government, the people were absolved from all rules of obedience.

However, all the engines of arbitrary power were set at work to raise money for the war, as loans, benevolences, ship-money, coat and conduct money, knighthood, monopolies, and other springs of the prerogative, some of which, says lord Clarendon, were ridiculous, and others scandalous, but all very grievous to the subject. Those who refused payment, were fined and imprisoned by the star-chamber or council-table, among whom were some of the aldermen of London, and sheriffs of several of the counties. The courtiers advanced 300,000*l.* in three weeks, the clergy in convocation gave six subsidies, the Papists were very generous; Strafford went over to Ireland, and obtained four subsidies of the parliament of that kingdom; soldiers were pressed into the service in all counties, few listing themselves voluntarily except Papists, many of whom had commissions in the army, which gave rise to a common saying among the people, that the queen's army of Papists were going to establish the Protestant religion in Scotland.

The people groaned under these oppressions, the odium whereof fell upon Laud and Strafford, who were libelled and threatened with the fury of the populace. May 9, 1640, a paper was fixed upon the old Exchange, animating the apprentices to pull the archbishop out of his palace at Lambeth; upon this the trained bands were ordered into St. George's Fields; nevertheless, the mob rose and broke his windows, for which one of them being apprehended suffered death as a traitor, though he could not be guilty of more than a breach of the peace. From Lambeth the mob went to the house of the pope's agent, where they were dispersed by the king's guards, and some of them sent to the White-lion prison; but the following week [May 15], they rose again and rescued their friends. The country was in the same mutinous posture, there being frequent skirmishes between them and the new-raised soldiers, even to blood shed. The city train-bands were in arms all the summer, but the campaign proving unsuccessful, there was no keeping the people within bounds afterward; for while the high commission was sitting at St. Paul's, October 22, near two thousand Brownists, as the archbishop calls them, came in a disturbance, and broke up the court, crying out, No

bishops no high-commission. Such were the distempers of the times!

The convocation that sat with this parliament was opened April 14, with more splendour and magnificence than the situation of affairs required. The sermon was preached by Dr. Turner, canon residentiary of St. Paul's, from St. Matt. xvi. 16, "Behold, I send you forth as sheep among wolves." After which they adjourned to the chapter-house, where the king's writ of summons being read, the archbishop, in a Latin speech, recommended to the lower house the choosing a prolocutor, to be presented to himself or his commissary in the chapel of Henry VII. on Friday following, to which time and place the convocation was adjourned.

On the 17th of April after divine service, Dr. Steward dean of Chichester and clerk of the closet, was presented to the archbishop as prolocutor in the chapel of Henry VII. whom his grace approved, and then produced his majesty's commission under the great seal, authorizing them "to make and ordain certain canons and constitutions, for the establishing true religion, and the profit of the state of the church of England."* The commission was to remain in force during the present session of parliament, and no longer; and by a remarkable clause, "nothing was to be concluded without the archbishop's being a party in the consultation." It was intended also to draw up an English pontifical, which was to contain,—The form and manner of royal coronations.—A form for consecrating churches, churchyards, and chapels.—A form for reconciling penitents and apostates.—A book of articles to be used by all bishops at their visitation.—And a short form of prayer for before sermon, comprehending the substance of the fifty-fifth canon. But most of these projects were interrupted by the sudden dissolution of the parliament.

The convocation, according to ancient custom, should have broken up at the same time, but one of the lower house having acquainted the archbishop with a precedent in the 27th year of queen Elizabeth, of the clergy's granting a subsidy or benevolence, of two shillings in the pound, to be raised upon all the clergy, after the parliament was risen, and levying it by their own synodical act only, under the penalty of ecclesiastical censures, it was concluded from

* Collyer's Eccles. Hist. p. 793. Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 127.

thence that the convocation might sit independent of the parliament, and therefore, instead of dissolving, they only adjourned for a few days to take farther advice.*

The zealous archbishop, relying upon this single precedent, applied to the king for a commission to continue the convocation during his majesty's pleasure, in order to finish the canons and constitutions, and to grant the subsidies already voted. The case being referred to the judges, the majority gave it as their opinion, "that the convocation being called by the king's writ under the great seal, doth continue till it be dissolved by writ or commission under the great seal, notwithstanding the parliament be dissolved."

Signed May 14, 1640, by John Finch, Custos, M. S.

H. Manchester, Ralph Whitfield, Edw. Littleton,
John Bramston, Rob. Heath, John Banks.

Upon this a commission under the great seal was granted, and the convocation reassembled; however, notwithstanding the opinion of these gentlemen of the long robe, Dr. Hacket, Brownrigge, Holdisworth, and others, to the number of thirty-six, protested earnestly against it, though because the session was warranted by so many considerable persons, they did not withdraw, nor enter their protest in form of law, as they ought to have done.† They were farther so influenced by his majesty's message sent by sir H. Vane, secretary of state, to acquaint them, "that it was his royal pleasure, that none of the prelates or clergy should withdraw from the synod or convocation, till the affairs they had in command from the king were perfected and finished."

Upon this dubious foundation the convocation was continued, and a committee of twenty-six appointed to prepare matters for the debate of the house; but the mob being so inflamed as to threaten to pull down the convocation-house, the king appointed them a guard of the militia of Middlesex, commanded by Endymion Porter, groom of the bedchamber, a Papist, under whose protection the synod was continued till the canons were perfected, and six subsidies granted by way of supply for the exigence of his majesty's affairs, to be collected in six years, after the rate of four shillings in the pound, amounting to about 120,000*l.* after which it was dissolved [May 29], by a special mandate or writ from

* Baker's Apeal, p. 67. 69. † Fuller's Church History, b. 9. p. 168.

his majesty, after it had continued twenty-five sessions. The canons, having been approved by the privy-council, were subscribed by as many of both houses of convocation as were present, and then transmitted to the provincial synod of York, by whom they were subscribed at once, without so much as debating either matter or form. Dr. John Williams, bishop of Lincoln, was in the Tower, and had no concern with the canons. Dr. Goodman, bishop of Gloucester, a concealed Papist, was the only prelate who declined the subscription; till the archbishop threatened him with deprivation, and the rest of his brethren pressing him to comply, he was persuaded to put his name to the book; but several of the members of the lower house avoided the test, by withdrawing before the day of subscription; for out of above one hundred and sixty, of which both houses of convocation consisted, there were not many more than one hundred names to the book.

The unreasonableness of continuing the synod after the dissolution of parliament appears from hence, that the convocation consisting of bishops, deans, archdeacons, and clerks, the three former act in their personal capacities only, and may give for themselves what subsidies they please; but the clerks being chosen for their respective cathedrals and dioceses, legally to sit as long as the parliament continues, desist from being public persons as soon as it is dissolved, and lose the character of representatives; they are then no more than private clergymen, who, though they may give the king what sums of money they please for themselves, cannot vote away the estates of their brethren, unless they are re-elected. Besides, it was contrary to all law and custom, both before and since the act of submission of the clergy to king Henry VIII. except in the single instance of queen Elizabeth.

The canons of this synod, consisting of seventeen articles, were published June 30, and entitled, "Constitutions and canons ecclesiastical, treated upon by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, presidents of the convocation for their respective provinces, and the rest of the bishops and clergy of those provinces, and agreed upon with the king's majesty's licence, in their several synods begun at London and York 1640."*

* Rushw. Collections, p. 518.

Canon 1.—*Concerning the Regal Power.*

"We ordain and decree, that every parson, vicar, curate, or preacher, upon one Sunday in every quarter of the year, in the place where he serves, shall read the following explanation of the regal power:

"That the most high and sacred order of kings is of divine right, being the ordinance of God himself, founded in the prime laws of nature and revelation, by which the supreme power over all persons civil and ecclesiastical is given to them.

"That they have the care of God's church, and the power of calling and dissolving councils, both national and provincial.

"That for any persons to set up in the king's realms any independent coercive power, either Papal or popular, is treasonable against God and the king. And for subjects to bear arms against their king, either offensive or defensive, upon any pretence whatsoever, is at least to resist the powers ordained of God; and though they do not invade, but only resist, St. Paul says, they shall receive damnation.

"And though tribute and custom, aid and subsidy, be due to the king, by the law of God, nature, and nations, yet subjects have a right and property in their goods and estates; and these two are so far from crossing one another, that they mutually go together for the honourable and comfortable support of both.

"If any clergyman shall voluntarily and carelessly neglect to publish these explications, he shall be suspended; or if in any sermon, or public lecture, he shall maintain any position contrary hereunto, he shall be forthwith excommunicated and suspended for two years; and if he offend a second time he shall be deprived."

Canon 2.—*For the better observing the Day of his Majesty's Inauguration.*

"The synod decrees and ordains, that all persons shall come to church the morning of the said day, and continue there till prayers and preaching are ended, upon pain of such punishment as the law inflicts on those who wilfully absent themselves from church on holy days."

Canon 3.—*For suppressing the Growth of Popery.*

"All ecclesiastical persons within their several parishes or jurisdictions, shall confer privately with Popish recusants, but if private conference prevail not, the church must and shall come to her censures, and to make way for them, such persons shall be presented at the next visitation, who come not to church, and refuse to receive the holy eucharist; or who either say or hear mass; and if they remain obstinate after citation, they shall be excommunicated.

"But if neither conference nor censures prevail, the church shall then complain of them to the civil power; and this sacred synod does earnestly entreat the reverend justices of assize, to be careful in executing the laws, as they will answer it to God. And every bishop shall once a year send into the court of chancery, a *significavit* of the names of those who have stood excommunicated beyond the time limited by law, and shall desire, that a writ *de excommunicato capiendo* may be at once sent out against them all.

"Care is likewise to be taken, that no person be admitted to teach school, but who has subscribed to the church as the law directs; and that no excommunicate person be absolved by any appeal, unless he first take the oath *de parendo juri et stando mandatis ecclesiæ.*"

Canon 4.—*Against Socinianism.*

"It is decreed, that no persons shall import, print, or disperse, any of their books, on pain of excommunication, and of being farther punished in the star-chamber. No minister shall preach any such doctrines in his sermons, nor student have any such books in his study, except he be a graduate in divinity;* and if any layman embrace their opinions, he shall be excommunicated, and not absolved without repentance and abjuration."

[N. B. None of the doctrines of Socinus, nor any of his peculiar sentiments, are mentioned in this canon.]

Canon 5.—*Against Sectaries.*

"The synod decrees, that the canon above mentioned against Papists shall be in full force against all Anabaptists,

* Dr. Grey supplies here from Nelson "or such as have [illegible] or archidiaconal ordination or any doctor of laws in order [illegible] said [illegible] Ed.

Brownists, Separatists, and other sectaries, as far as they are applicable; and farther, the clause against the books of Socinians above mentioned, shall be in force against all books written against the discipline and government of the church of England.

"It is also ordained, that such persons who resort to their parish-churches to hear the sermon, but do not join in the public prayers, shall be subject to the same penalties with other sectaries and recusants."

Canon 6.—*An Oath for preventing Innovations in Doctrine and Government*

"The synod decrees, that all archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, shall, before the 2d of November next, take the following oath, which shall be tendered by the bishop in person, or some grave divine deputed by him, and shall be taken in presence of a public notary."

The oath.

"I, A. B. do swear, that I do approve the doctrine, discipline, or government, established in the church of England, as containing all things necessary to salvation; and that I will not endeavour by myself or any other, directly or indirectly, to bring in any Popish* doctrine, contrary to that which is so established; nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, &c. as it stands now established, and as by right it ought to stand, nor yet ever to subject it to the usurpations and superstitions of the see of Rome. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation, or mental evasion, or secret reservation, whatsoever; and this I do heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the faith of a Christian. So help me God in Jesus Christ."

"If any beneficed person in the church shall refuse this oath, he shall after one month† be suspended *ab officio*; after a second month he shall be suspended *ab officio et be-*

* In his majesty's duplicate of this canon, sent by the archbishop to the bishop of [illegible], the word Popish is omitted, as it is in the duplicate sent to the vice-chancellor [illegible] and several others.

† [illegible] to inform himself."

ncficio; and after a third month,* if he continue to refuse, he shall be deprived.

"It is likewise ordained, that all that are incorporated in either of the universities, or take any degree, whether lawyers, divines, or physicians, shall take the same oath:† and all governors of halls and colleges in the university; all schoolmasters, and in general, all that enter into holy orders, or have licence to preach."

Canon 7.—*A Declaration concerning some Rites and Ceremonies.*

"The synod declares, that the standing of the communion-table sideways, under the east window of the chancel or chapel, is in its own nature indifferent; but forasmuch as queen Elizabeth's injunctions order it to be placed where the altar was, we therefore judge it proper, that all churches and chapels do conform themselves to the cathedral or mother-churches. And we declare, that the situation of the holy table does not imply that it is or ought to be esteemed a true and proper altar, whereon Christ is again sacrificed; but it may be called an altar in the sense of the primitive church; and because it has been observed that some people in time of divine service have irreverently leaned, cast their hats, or sat, upon or under the communion-table, therefore the synod thinks meet that the table be railed round.

"It is further recommended to all good people, that they do reverence at their entering in and going out of the church; and that all communicants do approach the holy table to receive the communion at the rails,‡ which has heretofore been unfitly carried up and down by the minister, unless the bishop shall dispense with it."

Canon 8.—*Of preaching for Conformity.*

"All public preachers shall twice a year preach positively and plainly, that the rites and ceremonies of the church of England are lawful, and that it is the duty of all people to conform to them."

* "For his better information."

† The sons of noblemen are expressly excepted. De Quer.

‡ "At the rails" is not in the original, but appears to be implied by the order to rail round the communion-table.—Ed.

Canon 9.—*A Book of Articles for Parochial Visitation.*

"No other book of articles of inquiry shall be used in parochial visitation, but that which is drawn up by the synod."

Canon 10.—*Of the Conversation of the Clergy.*

"The clergy are enjoined to avoid all excesses and disorders, and by their Christian conversation to adorn their holy profession."

Canon 11.—*Chancellors' Patents.*

"No bishop shall grant any patent to any chancellor, or official, for any longer term than the life of the grantees, and the bishop shall keep in his own hands the power of instituting to benefices, and of licensing to preach."

Canon 12.—*Chancellors' Censures.*

"No chancellor, commissary, or official, not being in holy orders, shall inflict any censure on the clergy in criminal causes, other than for neglect of appearing; but all such causes shall be heard by the bishop, or some dignified clergyman with the chancellor."

Canon 13.—*Excommunication and Absolution.*

"No sentence of excommunication or absolution shall be pronounced but by a priest, and in open consistory, or at least in the church or chapel, having first received it under the seal of an ecclesiastical judge, from whom it comes."

Canon 14.—*Of Commutations.*

"No commutation of penance to be admitted with consent of the bishop, and the money to be disposed of to charitable uses."

Canon 15.—*Of Jurisdictions.*

"No executor shall be cited into any court or office, for the space of ten days after the death of the testator, though the executor may prove the will within such time."

Canon 16.—*Of Licences to marry.*

"No licence to marry shall be granted to any party, un-

less one of the parties have been *commorant* in the jurisdiction of the ordinary to whom he applies, for the space of one month before the said licence be desired. The archiepiscopal prerogative is excepted."

Canon 17.—*Against vexatious Citations.*

"No citation into any ecclesiastical court shall be issued out but under the hand and seal of one of the judges of those courts, and within thirty days after committing the crime; and unless the party be convicted by two witnesses, he shall be allowed to purge himself by oath, without paying any fee; provided that this canon extend not to any grievous crime, as schism, incontinence, misbehaviour in the church in the time of divine service, obstinate inconformity, or the like."

When these canons were made public, they were generally disliked; several pamphlets were printed against them, and dispersed among the people; as, "England's complaint to Jesus Christ against the bishops' canons; wherein the nakedness of them is exposed in a solemn application to Jesus Christ as the Saviour of his church." "Queries relating to the several articles and determinations of the late synod," &c. All who loved the old English constitution were dissatisfied with the first canon, because it declares for the absolute power of kings, and for the unlawfulness of defensive arms on any pretence whatsoever. The Puritans disapproved the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth canons; but the whole body of the clergy were nearly concerned in the sixth, being obliged by the 2d of November to take the oath therein mentioned, on pain of suspension and deprivation. The London clergy, among whom were, Dr. Westfield, Downham, Burges, Mr. Calamy, Jackson, John Goodwin, Offspring, and others, drew up a petition against it to the privy council; and to give it the more weight procured a great many hands. The ministers, schoolmasters, and physicians, in Kent, Devonshire, Dorsetshire, Northamptonshire, and in most counties of England, took the same method; some objecting to the oath, as contrary to the oath of supremacy: some complaining of the *et cetera* in the middle. Others objected to the power of the synod to impose an oath, and many confessed, that they wished some things in the discipline of the church might be altered, and therefore could

not swear never to attempt it in a proper way. Some of the bishops endeavoured to satisfy their clergy by giving the most favourable interpretation to the oath. Bishop Hall told them that it meant no more than this, "That I do so far approve of the discipline and doctrine of this church, as that I do believe there is nothing in any other pretended discipline or doctrine necessary to salvation, besides that which is contained in the doctrine and discipline of the church of England. And as I do allow the government by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, so I will not, upon the suggestion of any factious persons, go about to alter the same as it now stands, and as by due right (being so established) it ought to stand in the church of England."* But most of the bishops pressed the oath absolutely on their clergy; and to my certain knowledge, says Mr. Fuller,† obliged them to take it kneeling, a ceremony never required in taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy; but to such extravagance of power did these prelates aspire upon the wing of the prerogative.

The archbishop was advised of these difficulties by Dr. Sanderson, afterward bishop of Lincoln, who assured his grace by letter,‡ "that multitudes of churchmen, not only of the preciser sort, but of such as were regular and conformable, would utterly refuse to take the oath, or be brought to it with much difficulty and reluctance; so that unless by his majesty's special direction, the pressing the oath may be forborne for a time; or that a short explanation of some passages in it most liable to exception, be sent to the several persons, who are to administer the same, to be publicly read before the tender of the said oath,—the peace of this church is apparently in danger to be more disquieted by this one occasion, than by any thing that has happened within our memories." However, this resolute prelate, as if he had been determined to ruin his own and his majesty's affairs, would relax nothing to the times, but would have broken the king's interest among the conformable clergy, if the nobility and gentry with the king at York, had not prevailed with his majesty to lay him under a restraint by the following letter under the hand of the principal secretary of state:

* Nalson's Collection, p. 490, 499.
† Book II. p. 171.
‡ Nalson, p. 497.

"May it please your grace,

"I am by his majesty's command to let you know, that upon several petitions presented by divers churchmen, as well in the diocess of Canterbury as York, to which many hands are subscribed, as the mode of petitions now are, against the oath in the canons made in the last synod, his majesty's pleasure is, that as he took order before his coming into these parts, that the execution of neither should be pressed on those that were already beneficed in the church, which was ordered at the council-board in your grace's presence, but that it should be administered to those who were to receive orders and to be admitted; it is his majesty's pleasure, that those should be dispensed with also, and that there be no prosecution thereof till the meeting of the convocation.

"York, September 30, 1640. H. VANE."*

We have mentioned the secret correspondence between the English and Scots nobility to recover the liberties of both kingdoms, which encouraged the Scots to march a second time to their border, where the king met them with his army commanded by the earls of Northumberland and Strafford; but it soon appeared that the English nobility were not for conquering the Scots; nor had the Protestant soldiers any zeal in his majesty's cause, so that after a small skirmish the Scots army passed the Tweed, August 21, and on the 30th took possession of the important town of Newcastle, the royal army retreating before them as far as York, and leaving them masters of the three northern counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, and Durham, where they subsisted their army, and raised what contributions they pleased. As soon as the Scots entered Newcastle, they sent an express to the lord-mayor and aldermen of London, to assure them they would not interrupt the trade between that town and the city of London, but would cultivate all manner of friendship and brotherly correspondence. They also sent messengers to the king, with an humble petition, that his majesty would please "to confirm their late acts of parliament, restore their ships and merchandize, recall his proclamation which styles them rebels, and call an English parliament to settle the peace between both kingdoms." This was followed by another signed by twelve peers with his

* Nalson's Collection, p. 900.

majesty at York, and by a third from the city of London. The king finding it impossible to carry on the war, appointed commissioners to treat with the Scots at Rippon, who agreed to a cessation of arms for two months, from the 26th of October, the Scots to have 850*l.* a day for maintenance of their army; and the treaty to be adjourned to London, where a free parliament was immediately to be convened. The calling an English parliament was the grand affair that had been concerted with the Scots before their coming into England; and it was high time; because to all appearance this was the last crisis for saving the constitution. If the Irish and English armies were raised to reduce Scotland, under the arbitrary power of the prerogative (as lord Clarendon confesses), what could be expected, but that afterward they should march back into England, and establish the same despotic power here, with a standing army, beyond all recovery?

Sad and melancholy was the condition of the prime-ministers, when they saw themselves reduced to the necessity of submitting their conduct to the examination of an English parliament, supported by an army from Scotland, and the general discontents of the people! Several of the courtiers began to shift for themselves; some withdrew from the storm, and others, having been concerned in various illegal projects, deserted their masters, and made their peace by discovering the king's counsels to the leading members of parliament, which disabled the junto from making any considerable efforts for their safety. All men had a veneration for the person of the king, though his majesty had lost ground in their affections by his ill-usage of parliaments, and by taking the faults of his ministers upon himself. But the queen was in no manner of esteem with any who had the Protestant religion, and the liberties of their country, at heart. The bishops had sunk their character by their behaviour in the spiritual courts, so that they had nothing to expect but that their wings should be clipped. And the judges were despised and hated, for betraying the laws of their country, and giving a sanction to the illegal proceedings of the council and star-chamber. As his majesty had few friends of credit or interest among the people at home, so he had nothing to expect from abroad; France and Spain were pleased with his distress: the foreign Pro-

testants wished well to the oppressed people of England; they published their resentments against the bishops, for their hard usage of the Dutch and French congregations, and gave it as their opinion, that a Protestant king who countenanced Papists, and at the same time drove his Protestant subjects out of the kingdom, was not worthy the assistance of the reformed churches, especially after he had renounced communion with them, and declared openly, that the religion of the church of England was not the same with that of the foreign Protestants.

Three considerable divines of a very different character died about this time; Mr. John Ball, educated in Brazennose college, Oxon, and afterward minister of Whitmore, a small village near Newcastle in Staffordshire, where he lived upon 20*l.* a year, and the profits of a little school. He was a learned and pious man, deserving as high esteem, says Mr. Baxter, as the best bishop in England, though he was content with a poor house, a mean habit, and a small maintenance. Being dissatisfied with the terms of conformity, it was some time before he could meet with an opportunity to be ordained without subscription, but at last he obtained it from the hands of an Irish bishop, then occasionally in London; though he lived and died a Nonconformist, he was an enemy to a separation, and wrote against Mr. Can and Mr. Robinson upon that head. His last work, entitled, "A stay against straying," was subscribed by five most noted Presbyterian divines, who all testified that he died abundantly satisfied in the cause of nonconformity, which he distinguished from separation. His other works were very numerous, and of great reputation in those times. He died October 20, 1640, in the fifty-sixth year of his age.*

Dr. Lawrence Chadderton, born in Lancashire 1546, of Popish parents, who, when they heard their son had changed his religion, disinherited him; he was first fellow of Christ's college, and afterward minister of Emanuel-college, Cambridge. King James nominated him one of the four representatives of the Puritans in the Hampton-court conference; and afterward one of the translators of the Bible.† He commenced D. D. 1612, and governed his college with great reputation many years, being remarkable for gravity, learn-

* Clarke's Lives annexed to his General Martyrology, p. 147. † Ibid. p. 116.

ing, and piety; he had a plain but effectual way of preaching, says Fuller,* having a strict regard for the sabbath, and a great aversion to Arminianism. He was a fine grey-headed old gentleman, and could read without spectacles to his death, which happened in the hundred and third year of his age. Being advanced in years, and afraid of being succeeded by an Arminian divine, he resigned his mastership to Dr. Preston, whom he survived; and saw Dr. Sancroft, and after him Dr. Holdisworth succeed him, which last attended his funeral at St. Andrew's church, and gave him a large and deserved commendation in a funeral sermon.

Dr. Richard Neile, archbishop of York, born in King-street, Westminster, of mean parents, his father being a tallowchandler. He was educated in St. John's college, Cambridge, and passed through all the degrees and orders of preferment in the church of England, having been a schoolmaster, curate, vicar, parson, chaplain, master of the Savoy, dean of Westminster, clerk of the closet to two kings, bishop of Rochester, Litchfield, Lincoln, Durham, Winchester; and lastly, archbishop of York. The Oxford historian says, he was an affectionate subject to his prince, an indulgent father to his clergy, a bountiful patron to his chaplains, and a true friend to all that relied upon him. Dr. Heylin confesses, that he was not very eminent either for parts or learning; Mr. Prynne says, he was a Popish Arminian prelate, and a persecutor of all orthodox and godly ministers. It is certain he had few or none of the qualifications of a primitive bishop; he hardly preached a sermon in twelve years, and gained his preferments by flattery and servile court-compliances. He was a zealous advocate for pompous innovations in the church, and oppressive projects in the state, for which he would have felt the resentments of the house of commons, had he lived a little longer; but he died very seasonably for himself in an advanced age, October 31, 1640, three days before the meeting of the long parliament.

[To the divines to whose memory Mr. Neal pays the just tribute of respect in this chapter, may be added the great Mr. Joseph Mede. He was descended from a good family, and born in October 1586, at Berden in Essex. He received his grammar learning first at Hoddesdon, in Hert-

* Book 2. p. 110.

fordshire, and finished it at Weathersfield in Essex. While he was at this last school, he bought Bellarmine's Hebrew grammar, and without the assistance of a master, attained considerable skill in the Hebrew tongue. In 1602 he was sent to Christ's college in Cambridge. In 1612 he took the degree of master of arts; and 1618, that of bachelor in divinity; but his modesty and humility restrained him from taking the degree of doctor. After taking the first degree, by the influence of bishop Andrews he was chosen fellow of his college: having been passed over at several elections, as one suspected of favouring Puritanical principles. In 1627, at the recommendation of archbishop Usher, he was elected provost of Trinity-college, Dublin, but declined accepting this preferment; as he did also, when it was offered him a second time in 1630. On the small income of his fellowship and a college-lecture he was extremely generous and charitable; and constantly appropriated a tenth of it to charitable uses. Temperance, frugality, and a care to avoid unnecessary expenses, enabled him to do this. His thoughts were much employed on the generous design of effecting a universal pacification amongst Protestants. It was a favourite saying with him, "that he never found himself prone to change his hearty affections to any one, for mere difference in opinion." He was a friend to free inquiry: "I cannot believe (said he) that truth can be prejudiced by the discovery of truth; but I fear that the maintenance thereof by fallacy or falsehood may not end with a blessing." He was an eminent and faithful tutor. It was his custom to require the attendance of his pupils in the evening, to examine them on the studies of the day; the first question he then proposed to every one in his order was, "Quid dubitasti?" What doubts have you met with in your studies to day? For he supposed that to doubt nothing, and to understand nothing, was nearly the same thing. Before he dismissed them to their lodgings, after having solved their questions, he commended them and their studies to God's protection and blessing by prayer. He was anxious and laborious in his study of history and antiquities, and diligently applied every branch of knowledge to increase his skill in the sacred writings. He led the way in shewing that Papal Rome was one principal object of the Apocalyptic visions; and was the first who suggested the sentiments since espoused and do-

fended by the pens of Lardner, Sykes, and Farmer, that the demoniacs in the New Testament were not real possessions, but persons afflicted with a lunacy and epilepsy. His days were spent in studious retirement. He died on the 1st of October 1638, in the fifty-second year of his age. In 1677, a complete edition of his works was published in folio by Dr. Worthington. British Biography, vol. 4. p. 446—452, and his life prefixed to his works.—Ed.]

CHAP. VII.

KING CHARLES I. 1640.

THE CHARACTER OF THE LONG PARLIAMENT. THEIR ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE LATE CONVOCATION AND CANONS. THE IMPEACHMENT OF DR. WILLIAM LAUD, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. VOTES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS AGAINST THE PROMOTERS OF THE LATE INNOVATIONS.

We are now entering upon the proceedings of the long parliament, which continued sitting with some little intermission for above eighteen years, and occasioned such prodigious revolutions in church and state, as were the surprise and wonder of all Europe. The house of commons have been severely censured for the ill success of their endeavours to recover and secure the constitution of their country; but the attempt was glorious, though a train of unforeseen accidents rendered it fatal in the event. The members consisted chiefly of country gentlemen, who had no attachment to the court; for, as Whitelocke observes, "Though the court laboured to bring in their friends, yet those who had most favour with them, had least in the country; and it was not a little strange to see what a spirit of opposition to the court proceedings was in the hearts and actions of most of the people, so that very few of that party had the favour of being chosen members of this parliament."* Mr. Echard insinuates some unfair methods of election, which might be true on both sides; but both he and lord Clarendon admit

* Memorials, p. 45

that there were many great and worthy patriots in the house, and as eminent as any age had ever produced; men of gravity, of wisdom, and of great and plentiful fortunes, who would have been satisfied with some few amendments in church and state.

Before the opening of the session the principal members consulted measures for securing the frequency of parliaments; for redressing of grievances in church and state; and for bringing the king's arbitrary ministers to justice; to accomplish which it was thought necessary to set some bounds to the prerogative, and to lessen the power of the bishops; but it never entered into their thoughts to overturn the civil or ecclesiastical constitution, as will appear from the concurrent testimony of the most unexceptionable historians.

"As to their religion (says the noble historian*), they were all members of the established church, and almost to a man for episcopal government. Though they were undevoted enough to the court, they had all imaginable duty for the king, and affection for the government established by law, or ancient custom; and without doubt the majority of that body were persons of gravity and wisdom, who being possessed of great and plentiful fortunes, had no mind to break the peace of the kingdom, or to make any considerable alterations in the government of the church or state." Dr. Lewis Du Moulin, who lived through these times, says, "that both lords and commons were most, if not all, peaceable, orthodox church of England men, all conforming to the rites and ceremonies of episcopacy, but greatly averse to Popery and tyranny, and to the corrupt part of the church that inclined towards Rome." This is farther evident from their order of November 20, 1640, that none should sit in their house but such as would receive the communion according to the usage of the church of England. The commons, in their grand remonstrance of December 1, 1641, declared to the world, "that it was far from their purpose to let loose the golden reins of discipline and government in the church, to leave private persons, or particular congregations, to take up what form of divine service they pleased; for we hold it requisite (say they) that there should be throughout the whole realm a confor-

* Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 104, 8vo.

mity to that order which the law enjoins, according to the word of God." The noble historian adds farther, "that even after the battle of Edgehill the design against the church was not grown popular in the house; that in the years 1642 and 1643, the lords and commons were in perfect conformity to the church of England, and so was their army, the general and officers both by sea and land being neither Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, nor conventiclers; and that when they cast their eyes upon Scotland, there were in truth very few in the two houses who desired the extirpation of episcopacy. Nay, his lordship is of opinion, that the nation in general was less inclined to the Puritans than to the Papists; at least, that they were for the establishment, for when the king went to Scotland [1641], the common prayer was much reverenced throughout the kingdom, and was a general object of veneration with the people.—There was a full submission and love to the established government of the church and state, especially to that part of the church which concerned the liturgy and Book of Common Prayer;" which, though it be hardly credible, as will appear hereafter by the numbers of petitions from several counties against the hierarchy, yet may serve to silence those of his lordship's admirers, who through ignorance and ill-will have represented the long parliament, and the body of the Puritans at their first sitting down, as in a plot against the whole ecclesiastical establishment.

If we may believe his lordship's character of the leading members of both houses, even of those who were most active in the war against the king, we shall find even they were true churchmen according to law; and that they had no designs against episcopacy, nor any inclinations to presbytery or the separation.

The earl of Essex was captain-general and commander in chief of the parliament army, and so great was his reputation that his very name commanded thousands into their service. It had been impossible for the parliament to have raised an army, in lord Clarendon's opinion, if the earl of Essex had not consented to be their general; and "yet this nobleman (says he*) was not indevoted to the function of bishops, but

* Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 182. 185. 189. 211, 212. 233. 507; and vol. 2. p. 211, 212. 214. 402. 597, &c.

was as much devoted as any man to the Book of Common Prayer, and obliged all his servants to be present with him at it; his household chaplain being always a conformable man, and a good scholar."

The earl of Bedford was general of the horse under the earl of Essex, but "he had no desire that there should be any alteration in the government of the church; he had always lived towards my lord of Canterbury himself, with all respect and reverence; he frequently visited and dined with him, subscribed liberally to the repairing of St. Paul's, and seconded all pious undertakings."

Lord Kimbolton, afterward earl of Manchester, was a man of great generosity and good breeding; and no man was more in the confidence of the discontented party, or more trusted; he was commander of part of the parliament-forces, and rather complied with the changes of the times than otherwise; he had a considerable share in the restoration of king Charles II. and was in high favour with him till his death.

The earl of Warwick was admiral of the parliament-fleet; he was the person who seized on the king's ships, and employed them against him during the whole course of the war; he was looked upon as the greatest patron of the Puritans, and "yet this nobleman (says lord Clarendon) never discovered any aversion to episcopacy, but much professed the contrary."

In truth, says the noble historian, when the bill was brought into the house to deprive the bishops of their votes in parliament, there were only at that time taken notice of in the house of peers, the lords Say and Brook, as positive enemies to the whole fabric of the church, and to desire a dissolution of the government.

Amongst the leading members in the house of commons, we may reckon William Lenthall, esq. their speaker, "who was of no ill reputation for his affection to the government both of church and state," says his lordship, and declared on his death-bed after the Restoration, that he had always esteemed episcopal government to be the best government of the church, and accordingly died a dutiful son of the church of England.

Mr. Pym had the leading influence in the house of commons, and was in truth the most popular man and most able

to do hurt of any who lived in his time; and yet, lord Clarendon says, "though he was an enemy to the Arminians, he professed to be very entirely for the doctrine and discipline of the church of England, and was never thought to be for violent measures, till the king came to the house of commons, and attempted to seize him amongst the five members."

Denzil Hollis, esq. after the Restoration promoted to the dignity of a baron, was at the head of all the parliament's councils till the year 1647. "He had an indignation (says lord Clarendon) against the Independents, nor was he affected to the Presbyterians, any otherwise than as they constituted a party to oppose the others, but was well pleased with the government of the church."

Sir H. Vane the elder did the king's affairs an unspeakable prejudice, and yet "in his judgment he liked the government both of church and state; nay, he not only appeared highly conformable himself, but exceeding sharp against those that were not."

Sir John Hotham was the gentleman who shut the gates of Hull against the king; and in a sally that he made upon the king's forces shed the first blood that was spilt in the civil war, and was the first his majesty proclaimed a traitor; and yet his lordship declares, "he was very well affected to the government."

His lordship is a little more dubious about the famous Mr. Hampden, but says, that most people believed "his dislike was rather to some churchmen, than to the ecclesiastical government of the church."

I might mention Mr. Whitelocke, Selden, Langhorne, and others, who are represented without the least inclination to presbytery; but it is sufficient to observe from his lordship, "that all the earl of Essex's party in both houses were men of such principles, that they desired no alteration in the court or government, but only of the persons that acted in it; nay, the chief officers of his army were so zealous for the liturgy, that they would not hear a man as a minister that had not episcopal ordination."

Nathaniel Fiennes, esq. sir H. Vane, jun. and shortly after Mr. Hampden, were believed to be for root and branch; yet, says his lordship, Mr. Pym was not of that mind, nor Mr. Hollis, nor any of the northern men, nor any of those lawyers who drove on most furiously with them;

all of whom were well pleased with the government of the church; for though it was in the hearts of some few to remove foundations, they had not the courage and confidence to communicate it.

This was the present temper and constitution of both houses; from which his lordship justly concludes, that "as they were all of them, almost to a man, conformists to the church of England, they had all imaginable duty for the king and affection for the government established by law; and as for the church, the major part even of these persons would have been willing to satisfy the king; the rather, because they had no reason to think the two houses, or indeed either of them, could have been induced to pursue the contrary." How injurious then are the characters of those church historians, and others, who have represented the members of this parliament, even at their first session, as men of the new religion, or of no religion, fanatics, men deeply engaged in a design against the whole constitution in church and state!

The parliament was opened November 3, with a most gracious speech from the throne, wherein his majesty declares, he would concur with them in satisfying their just grievances, leaving it with them where to begin. Only some offence was taken at styling the Scots, rebels, at a time when there was a pacification subsisting; upon which his majesty came to the house, and instead of softening his language, very imprudently avowed the expression, saying, he could call them neither better nor worse. The houses petitioned his majesty to appoint a fast for a divine blessing upon their counsels, which was observed November 17, the reverend Mr. Marshal and Mr. Burges preached before the commons; the former on 2 Chron. xv. 2, "The Lord is with you, while you are with him; if you seek him he will be found of you, but if you forsake him he will forsake you." The latter on Jer. l. 5, "They shall ask the way to Zion with their faces thitherward, saying, Come, and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten." The sermons were long, but delivered with a great deal of caution: the house gave them thanks, and a piece of plate for their labours. The bishops of Durham and Carlisle preached before the lords in the abbey-church of Westminster; the one a courtier, and the other a favourer

of the Puritans. The Lord's day following, all the members in a body received the sacrament from the hands of bishop Williams dean of Westminster, not at the rails about the altar, but at a communion-table placed by order of the house, in the middle of the church on that occasion.

At their first entrance upon business they appointed four grand committees; the first to receive petitions about grievances of religion, which was afterward subdivided into twenty or thirty; the second for the affairs of Scotland and Ireland; the third for civil grievances, as ship-money, judges, courts of justice, monopolies, &c. the fourth concerning Popery, and plots relating thereunto. Among the grievances of religion, one of the first things that came before the house was, the acts and canons of the late convocation; several warm speeches were made against the compilers of them, November 9, and among others lord Digby, who was as yet with the country party, stood up and said, "Does not every parliament-man's heart rise, to see the prelates usurping to themselves the grand pre-eminence of parliament? the granting subsidies under the name of a benevolence, under no less a penalty to them that refuse it, than the loss of heaven and earth; of heaven by excommunication, and of earth by deprivation, and this without redemption by appeal? What good man can think with patience, of such an ensnaring oath, as that which the new canons enjoin to be taken, by ministers, lawyers, physicians, and graduates in the university, where, besides the swearing such an impertinence, as that things necessary to salvation are contained in discipline; besides the swearing those to be of divine right, which among the learned was never pretended to, as the arch things in our hierarchy; besides the swearing not to consent to the change of that, which the state may, upon great reasons, think fit to alter; besides the bottomless perjury of an *et cætera*; besides all this, men must swear that they swear freely and voluntarily, what they are compelled to; and lastly, that they swear to the oath in the literal sense, whereof no two of the makers themselves, that I have heard of, could ever agree in the understanding."*

* Dr. Grey contends in this speech of lord Digby's, as far as it censures the convocation for taxing the clergy, with some reflections on it from Collyer, who asserts that the clergy had always the privilege of taxing their own body; that from magna charta to the 25th of Henry VIII. there is no parliamentary construction of subsidies given by the clergy; and that in 1586 there is an instance of the convocation grant-

Sir B. Rudyard, sir J. Culpeper, sir Edward Deering, sir Harbottle Grimstone, spoke with the same warmth and satirical wit, for discharging the canons, dismounting them, and melting them down; nor did any gentleman stand up in their behalf but Mr. Holbourn, who is said to make a speech of two hours in their vindication; but his arguments made no impression on the house, for at the close of the debate a committee of twelve gentlemen, among whom were Mr. Selden, Maynard, and Coke, was appointed to search for the warrants by which the convocation was held, after the parliament broke up, and for the letters patent of the benevolence, and for such other materials as might assist the house in their next debate upon this argument, which was appointed for December 14, when some of the members would have aggravated the crime of the convocation to high treason, but serjeant Maynard and Mr. Bagshaw moderated their resentments, by convincing them that they were only in a premunire. At the close of the debate the house came to the following resolutions:

Resolved *nem. contradicente*, "That the clergy of England convened in any convocation or synod, or otherwise, have no power to make any constitutions, canons, or acts, whatsoever, in matters of doctrine, discipline, or otherwise, to bind the clergy or laity of the land, without consent of parliament.

Resolved, "That the several constitutions and canons ecclesiastical, treated upon by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, presidents of the convocations for their respective provinces, and the rest of the bishops and clergy of those provinces, and agreed upon with the king's majesty's licence, in their several synods begun at London and York 1640, do not bind the clergy or laity of the land, or either of them.

. . . .

ing and levying a subsidy or benevolence by synodical authority. The credit of Mr. Neal's History, in this point, is no farther concerned than as he faithfully reports what lord Digby's speech. This Dr. Grey does not dispute. Yet it may be proper to observe, that a great lawyer says, "that the grants of the clergy were ill got, and not binding, unless they were confirmed in parliament;" and that lord Clarendon, speaking of this convocation giving subsidies out of parliament, censures it as doing that "which it certainly might not do." The last subsidies granted by the clergy were those confirmed by the statute 15 Car. I. cap. 10. Since which the practice of granting ecclesiastical subsidies has given way to another method of taxation, comprehending the clergy as well as the laity; and no more imposition [illegible] the bounty of Queen Anne, are allowed to vote for knights of the shire. Hody's Hist. Convoc. vol. 2. p. 295. Blackstone's Comment. vol. I. p. 281 8vo. 1774. and Lord Clarendon's Hist. vol. I. p. 110. Ed.

Resolved, "That the several constitutions and canons made and agreed to in the convocations or synods above mentioned, do contain in them many matters contrary to the king's prerogative, to the fundamental laws and statutes of this realm, to the rights of parliament, to the property and liberty of the subject, and matters tending to sedition, and of dangerous consequence.

Resolved, "That the several grants of benevolences or contributions, granted to his most excellent majesty by the clergy of the provinces of Canterbury and York, in the several convocations or synods holden at London and York in the year 1640, are contrary to the laws, and ought not to bind the clergy."

If the first of these resolutions be agreeable to law, I apprehend there were then no canons subsisting, for those of 1603 were not brought into parliament, but, being made in a parliamentary convocation, were ratified by the king under the great seal, and so became binding on the clergy, according to the statute of the 25th of king Henry VIII. In the Saxon times all ecclesiastical laws and constitutions were confirmed by the peers, and by the representatives of the people;* but those great councils, to which our parliaments succeed, being made up of laics and ecclesiastics, were afterward separated, and then the clergy did their business by themselves, and enacted laws without confirmation of king or parliament, during the reign of Popery, till

* This Dr. Grey controverts, and says, "I should be glad to know what authority he has for this assertion." It is not for the editor to give the authority, when Mr. Neal has not himself referred to it; but he can supply the want of it by an authority, which, if Dr. Grey were living, would command his respect: viz. that of Dr. Burn, who tells us, that "even in the Saxon times, if the subject of any laws was for the outward peace and temporal government of the church, such laws were properly ordained by the king and his great council of clergy and laity intermixed, as our acts of parliament are still made. But if there was any doctrine to be tried, or any exercise of pure discipline to be reformed, then the clergy of the great council departed into a separate synod, and there acted as the proper judges. Only when they had thus provided for the state of religion, they brought their canons from the synod to the great council, to be ratified by the king, with the advice of his great men; and so made the constitutions of the church to be laws of the realm. And the Norman revolution made no change in this respect." This author in other ways, that the convocation-tax did always pass both houses of parliament; since it could not bind any law, till it had the consent of the legislature." Judge Foster in his examination of bishop Gibson's codex, appeals to the laws of Ethelbert and Withred, kings of Kent, and of Ina of Wessex; to the laws of Alfred, Edward the elder, Athelstan, Edmund, Edgar, and Canute, as proofs that the ecclesiastical and civil concerns of the kingdom were one, in the times of the Saxons, under the care of two separate legislatures, and subject to different administrations; but blended together, and directed by one and the same legislature, the great councils, or in modern style, the parliaments, of the respective kingdoms during the heptarchy, and of the united kingdom afterward. Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, vol. 2. p. 22, 29 8vo. An Examination of the Scheme of Church Power laid down in the Codex, p. 130, &c.—Ed.

the act of the submission of the clergy to king Henry VIII. so that the claim of making canons without the sanction of parliament, seemed to stand upon no other foundation than the usurped power of the pope; nor did the parliaments of those times yield up their right; for in the 51st of Edward III. the commons passed a bill, that no act or ordinance should be made for the future upon the petition of the clergy, without the consent of the commons; "and that the said commons should not be bound for the future by any constitutions of the clergy, to which they had not given their consent in parliament." But the bill being dropped, things went on upon the former footing till the reign of king Henry VIII.* when the pope's usurped power being abolished, both parliament and clergy agreed, by the act of submission, that no canons should be binding without the royal assent; and that the clergy in convocation should not so much as consult about any without the king's special licence. But serjeant Maynard delivered it as his opinion in the house, that it did not follow, that because the clergy might not make canons without the king's licence, that therefore they might make them and bind them on the clergy by his licence alone; for this were to take away the ancient rights of parliament before the pope's usurpation, which they never yielded up, nor does the act of submission of the clergy take away. Upon this reasoning the commons voted their first resolution, the strength of which I leave to the reader's consideration.

The arguments upon which the other resolutions are founded will be laid together, after we have related the proceedings of the convocation.

The convocation was opened November 4, 1640. Dr. Barkave, dean of Canterbury, preached the sermon, and Dr. Steward, dean of Chichester, was chosen prolocutor, and presented to the archbishop's acceptance in king Henry VII.'s chapel, when his grace made a pathetic speech, lamenting the danger of the church, and exhorting every one present to perform the duty of their places with resolution, and not to be wanting to themselves or the cause of religion; but nothing of moment was transacted, there being no commission from the king; only Mr. Warmistre, one of the clerks for the diocese of Worcester, being con-

* Fuller's Appeal, p. 47.

vinced of the invalidity of the late canons, moved the house that they might cover the pit which they had opened, and prevent a parliamentary inquisition, by petitioning the king for leave to review them; but his motion was rejected, the house being of opinion that the canons were justifiable; nor would they appear so mean as to condemn themselves before they were accused. Mr. Warmistre suffered in the opinion of his brethren within doors for his cowardly speech; and was reproached from without as an enemy to the church, and a turncoat, because he had subscribed those articles which now he condemned. This obliged him to publish his speech to the world, wherein, after having declared his satisfaction in the doctrine, discipline, and government, of the church of England, as far as it is established by law, he goes on to wish there had been no private innovations introduced; for though he approves of an outward reverence in the worship of God, he is against directing it to altars and images. He apprehends it reasonable, that such innocent ceremonies as have a proper tendency to decency and order should be retained, but wishes the removal of crosses and images out of churches, as scandalous and superstitious, having an apparent tendency towards idolatry; and that there might be no lighted candles in the day-time; he then gives his reasons against the oath in the sixth canon, and concludes with these words; "If my subscription be urged against what I have said, I was persuaded it was the practice of synods and councils, that the whole body should subscribe to those acts which are passed by the major part as synodical acts, notwithstanding their private dissent; if my subscription implied any more, I do so far recant and condemn it in myself and desire pardon both of God and the church, resolving by God's grace to be more cautious hereafter." Mr. Warmistre's behaviour showed him to be a wise and discreet clergyman; and his being sequestered from his livings some time after for not submitting to the parliament, shew him to have been a man of principle, not to be moved from his integrity by the resentments of his friends, or the flatteries of his enemies. And though the convocation was so sanguine at their first coming together, as to despise Mr. Warmistre's motion, yet when they saw the vigorous resolutions of the house of commons against the canons, and the articles of impeachment against the metropolitan for high treason, one of

which was for compiling the late canons, they were dispirited, and in a few weeks deserted their stations in the convocation-house; the bishops also discontinued their meetings, and in a few weeks both houses dwindled to nothing, and broke up without either adjournment or prorogation.

To return to the parliament. It was argued against the late convocation, that they were no legal assembly after the dissolution of the parliament; that his majesty had no more power to continue them than to recall his parliament;* nor could he by his letters patent convert them into a national or provincial synod, because the right of their election ceasing at the expiration of the convocation, they ought to have been rechosen before they could act in the name of the clergy whom they represented, or bind them by their decrees. It is contrary to all law and reason in the world, that a number of men met together in a convocation, upon a summons limited to a certain time, should after the expiration of that time, by a new commission, be changed into a national or provincial synod, without the voice or election of any one person concerned. The commons were therefore at a loss by what name to call this extraordinary assembly, being in their opinion neither convocation nor synod, because no representative body of the clergy. The words convocation and synod are convertible terms, signifying the same thing, and it is essential to both that they be chosen by (if they are to make constitutions and canons to bind) the clergy. Some indeed have thought of a small distinction, as that a convocation must begin and end with the parliament, whereas a synod may be called by the king out of parliament, but then such an assembly cannot give subsidies for

* Archbishop Laud, to exculpate himself from blame in this matter, declared, that "this sitting of the convocation was not by his advice or desire; but that he humbly desired a writ to do what it." It was set up in defence of this measure (and the argument has since been adopted by Dr. Warner), that the parliament and convocation being separate bodies, and convened by different writs, the dissolution of the former does not necessarily infer the dissolution of the latter, which could not cease till discharged by another writ. Dr. Burn has advanced this reason into a general principle, but on no other authority than that of Dr. Warner in this case. The lord-keeper, the judges, and king's council, assured the king, that the clergy might legally continue their sitting. But much allowance is to be made for the influence under which the opinion of court-lawyers is given; as in the case of ship-money. Mr Neal's reasoning on this point, carries great weight with it. Lord Clarendon speaks of the continued sitting of the convocation as rather unprecedented, for he says, that this assembling of the clergy customarily began and ended with parliament. It was evidently impolitic, in such a conjuncture of time, to deviate from the custom, and to stretch the prerogative. Dr. Grey's Examination of &c. Neal on's Collections, vol. 1. p. 366. Warner's Eccles. Hist. vol. 2. p. 554. Burn's Eccles. Law, vol. 2. p. 27; and Lord Clarendon's Hist. vol. 1. p. 149.—Ed.

their brethren, nor make laws by which they will be bound.

The objections to the particular canons were these:

1. Against the first canon it was argued, that the compilers of it had invaded the rights and prerogative of parliament, by pretending to settle and declare the extent of the king's power, and the subjects' obedience.

By declaring the sacred order of kings to be of divine right, founded in the prime laws of nature and revelation, by which they condemned all other governments.

By affirming that the king had an absolute power over all his subjects, and a right to the subsidies and aids of his people without consent of parliament.

By affirming that subjects may not bear arms against their king, either offensive or defensive, upon any pretence whatsoever, upon pain of receiving to themselves damnation.

By taking upon themselves to define some things to be treason not included in the statute of treasons.

And lastly, by inflicting a penalty on such of the king's subjects as shall dare to disobey them, in not reading and publishing the above-mentioned particulars; in all which cases it was averred that they had "invaded the rights of parliament, destroyed the liberty of the subject, and subverted the very fundamental laws and constitutions of England."

2. It was objected against the second canon, that they had assumed the legislative power, in appointing a new holy day contrary to the statute, which says, that there shall be such and such holy days and no more.

4. It was objected against the fourth canon, that whereas the determination of heresy is expressly reserved to parliament, the convocation had declared that to be heresy which the law takes no notice of; and had condemned Socinianism in general, without declaring what was included under that denomination, so that after all it was left in their own breasts, whom they would condemn and censure under that character.

6. It was objected against the sixth canon, that it imposed a new oath upon the subject, which is a power equal if not superior to the making a new law.* It was argued like-

* The archbishop, in reply to this objection, referred to various canons, made in king James's time, and appointing different oaths, merely by the authority of convocation, viz. canons 13, 14, 15, 16, and 27, as precedents, which had never been declared illegal, nor the makers of them censured by parliament; and which justified

wise against the oath itself, that in some parts it was very ambiguous and doubtful, and in others directly false and illegal.

We are to swear in the oath, that "we approve the doctrine, discipline, or government, established in the church of England," and yet we are not told wherein that doctrine and discipline are contained; whether by the doctrine of the church we are to understand only the thirty-nine articles, or likewise the homilies and church-catechism; and by the discipline, only the book of canons, or likewise all other ecclesiastical orders, not repealed by statute; for it is observable that the words of the oath are, "as it is established," and not, as it is established *by law*. And the ambiguity is farther increased by that remarkable *et cætera*, inserted in the body of the oath; for whereas oaths ought to be explicit, and the sense of the words as clear and determined as possible, we are here to swear to we know not what, to something that is not expressed; by which means we are left to the arbitrary interpretation of the judge, and may be involved in the guilt of perjury before we are aware.

But besides the ambiguity of the oath, it contains some things false and illegal; for it affirms the government of the church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, to be of divine right; for after we have sworn to the hierarchy as established by the law of the land, we are to swear farther, that "by right it ought so to stand:" which words are a mere tautology, or else must infer some farther right than that which is included in the legal establishment, which can be no other than a divine right. Now, though it should be allowed, that the government of the church by bishops is of divine right, yet certainly archbishops, deans, and archdeacons, can have no pretence to that claim.

Besides, to swear, "never to give our consent to alter the government of this church by archbishops, bishops, &c. as it stands now established," is directly contrary to the oath of supremacy, for in that oath we are sworn to assist his majesty in the exercise of his ecclesiastical jurisdiction or government, by his commission under the great seal, directed to such persons as he shall think meet; so that if his majesty

therefore, the power assumed by this convocation. His lordship in origin, and Dr. Grey in repeating, this defence, did not perceive, that it is a bad and insufficient plea for doing wrong, that others had escaped the censure and punishment due to illegal conduct. Grey's Examination in loc. Ld.

should think fit at any time to commission other persons to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction than at present, we are sworn by the oath of supremacy, not only to consent, but to aid and assist him in it; whereas in this new oath we swear, never to consent to any such alteration.

Nothing is more evident, than that the discipline of the church is alterable; the church itself laments the want of godly discipline; and many of the clergy and laity wish and desire an amendment; it is therefore very unreasonable, that all who take degrees in the universities, many of whom may be members of parliament, shall be sworn beforehand, "never to consent to any alteration." And though it is known to all the world that many of the conforming clergy are dissatisfied with some branches of the present establishment, yet they are to swear that they take this oath "heartily and willingly," though they are compelled to it under the penalties of suspension and deprivation. Some objections were made to the seventh and other canons, but these were the chief.

Archbishop Laud, in his answer to the impeachment of the house of commons against himself, boldly undertakes to refute all these objections, and to justify the whole, and every branch of the canons; his words are these: "I hope I am able to make it good in any learned assembly in Christendom, that this oath, and all those canons (then made, and here before recited), and every branch in them, are just and orthodox, and moderate, and most necessary for the present condition of the church of England, how unwelcome soever to the present distempers."* Lord Clarendon expresses himself modestly on the other side; he doubts, whether the convocation was a legal assembly after the dissolution of the parliament, and is very sure, that their proceedings are not to be justified. "The convocation-house (says he), which is the regular and legal assembling of the clergy, was, after the determination of the parliament, continued by a new writ under the proper title of a synod; made

* Dr. Grey asks here, "Where does the archbishop say this? Our historian quotes no authority; and as he is often faulty when he quotes chapter and verse, so without it I am unwilling wholly to depend upon his bare *ipse dixit*." The editor is not able at present, to supply here Mr. Neal's omission; but he finds the same words of archbishop Laud quoted by Dr. Warner (who never refers to his authorities), as spoken in the house of lords. And the doctor expresses on them his belief, that as to many of the articles contained in the canons, the archbishop here undertook to do what he would have found it difficult to make good. Eccles. History, vol. 2. p. 535.—Ed.

canons, which it was thought it might do; and gave subsidies out of parliament, and enjoined oaths, which certainly it might not do; in a word, did many things which in the best of times might have been questioned, and therefore were sure to be condemned in the worst." The parliament that sat after the Restoration was of the same mind with his lordship, forasmuch as these canons were excepted out of the act of 13 Car. II. cap. 12, and declared of no validity. Mr. Echard is of opinion, that the synod that framed these canons was not a legal representative of the clergy after the dissolution of the two houses. But bishop Kennet, in his complete history, says, that these public censures of the canons were grounded upon prejudice and faction; that it is hard to find any defect of legality in the making of them; and that if these canons were not binding, we have no proper canons since the Reformation; he therefore wishes them, or some others like them, revived, because "in very much of doctrine and discipline they are a good example to any future convocation; and, that we can hardly hope for unity, or any tolerable regularity, without some constitutions of the like nature." Strange! that a dignified clergyman, who held his bishoprick upon revolution principles, should wish the subversion of the constitution of his country, and declare for principles of persecution. If I might have liberty to wish, it should be, that neither we nor our posterity may ever enjoy the blessings of unity and regularity upon the footing of such canons.

Upon the same day that the house passed the above-mentioned resolutions against the canons, several warm speeches were made against the archbishop of Canterbury, as the chief author of them; and a committee was appointed to inquire more particularly, how far his grace had been concerned in the proceedings of the convocation, and in the treasonable design of subverting the religion and laws of his country, in order to draw up articles against him. Next day the earl of Bristol acquainted the house of lords, that the Scots commissioners had presented some papers against the archbishop of Canterbury,* which were read by the

* "Mr. Neal (says Dr. Grey) has given us all the objections of the Scots against the archbishop; and I am so old-fashioned a person, as to think, that the archbishop's answers to their objections should likewise have been produced by an impartial historian." He renews the same complaint against our author in his second volume, p. 173. Mr. Neal's reason, for passing over the archbishop's answer, appears to have

lord Paget, and then reported to the house of commons, at a conference between the two houses. Their charge consisted of divers grievances (which had occasioned great disturbances in the kingdom of Scotland), ranged under three heads, of all which they challenged the archbishop to be the chief author upon earth.

The first branch of the charge consisted of "divers alterations in religion, imposed upon them without order, and against law, contrary to the form established in their kirk;" as, his enjoining the bishops to appear in the chapel in their whites, (1.) contrary to the custom of their kirk, and the archbishop's own promise; his directing the English service to be read in the chapel twice a day; (2.) his ordering a list of those counsellors and senators of the college of justice, who did not communicate in the chapel, according to a form received in their kirk, to be sent up to him, in order to their being punished; (3.) his presumptuous censuring the practice of the kirk, in fasting sometimes on the Lord's day, as opposite to Christianity itself; (4.) his obtaining warrants for the sitting of a high-commission court once a week at Edinburgh; (5.) and his directing the taking down of galleries and stone-walls in the kirks of Edinburgh and

been, that his grace evaded the whole charge at his trial, by pleading the act of oblivion at the pacification of the Scots troubles. But, as Dr. Grey has endeavoured to supply Mr. Neal's deficiency, the substance of the archbishop's defences shall be given in the following notes; and the reader will judge of their importance, and of Mr. Neal's conduct in omitting them.—Ed.

(1.) His grace replies to this charge, "that he understood himself a great deal better than to enjoin where he had no power: and, perhaps he might express his majesty's command, as dean of his chapel in England, that the service in Scotland should be kept answerable to it here as much as might be."—Ed.

(2.) Here his grace pleads his majesty's command; and his hope, that it was no crime for a bishop in England to signify to one in Scotland, the king's pleasure concerning the service of his own chapel.—Ed.

(3.) The defence set up on this head by the archbishop was, the king's command; and that the form prescribed, which was kneeling, was an article of the synod of Perth, made in a general assembly, and confirmed by act of parliament. As to the requisition itself, he pleaded, that it amounted to no more, than if his majesty should command all his judges and counsellors in England, once in the year, to receive the communion in his chapel at Whitehall.—Ed.

(4.) The archbishop vindicates himself, in this instance, by ample testimonies from the fathers, and by decrees of ancient councils, to prove that, in the ancient church, it was held unlawful to fast on the Lord's day. The fact, there is no doubt, was so, and it gave the archbishop a ground of arguing with the church of Scotland on their practice: but would it justify the asperity of censure towards weaker Christians? or the exercise of authority, where every one ought to be persuaded in his own mind?—Ed.

(5.) His grace answers to this charge, that the warrants were not procured by him, but by a Scotchman, of good place, employed about it by the bishops: and that the high commission court was settled, and in full execution in the church of Scotland, in 1610, before ever he appeared in public life.—Ed.

St. Andrews, to make way for altars and adoration towards the east. (6.)

The second branch of their charge was, "his obtruding upon them a book of canons and constitutions ecclesiastical, devised for the establishing a tyrannical power in the persons of their prelates, over the consciences, liberties, and goods, of the people; (7.) and for abolishing that discipline and government of their kirk, which was settled by law, and had obtained amongst them ever since the Reformation." For proof of this they alleged that the book of canons was corrected, altered, and enlarged, by him at his pleasure, as appears by the interlineations and marginal notes in the book, written with the archbishop's own hand: that he had added some entire new canons, and altered others, in favour of superstition and Popery; and in several instances relating to the censures of the church, had lodged an unbounded power in the prelates over the consciences of men.

The third and great innovation with which they charged the archbishop, was, "the book of common prayer, administration of the sacraments, and other parts of divine worship, brought in without warrant from their kirk, to be universally received as the only form of divine service, under the highest pains both civil and ecclesiastical; (1.) which book contained many Popish errors and ceremonies, repugnant to their confession of faith, constitutions of their general assemblies, and to acts of parliament." Several of these errors are mentioned in the article, and they declare

(6.) The archbishop absolutely denies, to the best of his memory, giving command or direction, for taking down the galleries of St. Andrew's: and urges, that it was very improbable, that *he should* issue such commands, where he had nothing, who in London, and other parts of his province, permitted the galleries of the churches to stand. As to the galleries and stone-walls in the kirks of Edinburgh, they were removed by the king's command; not to make way for altars and adoration towards the east, but to convert the two churches into a cathedral.—Ed.

(7.) The term "obtruding" the archbishop thinks bold, especially as pointing at the king's authority, whose command enjoined the book of canons on the church of Scotland, and who in this exercised no other power than that which king James challenged as belonging to him in right of his crown. His grace does not allow the imputations cast on the book of canons; and, if they did belong to them, he pleads that it was owing to invincible ignorance and the Scotch bishops, who would not tell whether the canons went against their laws, if they did. As to himself, it was his constant advice, in the whole business, that nothing against law should be attempted. Ed.

(1.) "That the liturgy was brought in without warrant of the kirk," if it were true, the archbishop pleads was the fault of the Scotch prelates, whom he had, on all occasions, urged to do nothing, in this particular, without warrant of law; and to whom, though he approved the liturgy, and obeyed his majesty's command in helping to order that book, he wholly left the manner of introducing it, because he was ignorant of the laws of Scotland. Ed.

themselves ready, when desired, to discover a great many more of the same kind; all which were imposed upon the kingdom, contrary to their earnest supplications; and upon their refusal to receive the service-book, they were, by his grace's instigation, declared rebels and traitors; (2.) an army was raised to subdue them, and a prayer composed and printed by his direction, to be read in all the parish-churches in England, in time of divine service, wherein they are called "traitorous subjects, having cast off all obedience to their sovereign;" and supplication is made to the Almighty, to cover their faces with shame, as enemies to God and the king. They therefore pray, that the archbishop* may be immediately removed from his majesty's presence, and that he may be brought to a trial, and receive such censure as he has deserved, according to the laws of the kingdom.

The archbishop has left behind him a particular answer to these articles, in his diary,† which is written with peculiar sharpness of style, and discovers a great opinion of his own abilities, and a contempt of his adversaries; but either from a distrust of the strength of his reply, or for some other reasons, his grace was pleased wisely to evade the whole charge at his trial, by pleading the act of oblivion (3.) at the pacification of the Scots troubles.‡

When the report of these articles was made to the commons, the resentments of the house against the archbishop immediately broke out into a flame; many severe speeches were made against his late conduct; and among others, one was by sir Harbottle Grimstone, speaker of that parliament which restored king Charles II. who stood up and said, "that this great man, the archbishop of Canterbury, was the very sty of all that pestilential filth that had infested

(2.) His grace contends, that they deserved these titles, but he did not pretend that they should be declared such: but the proclamation fixing these names on them went out by the common advice of the lords of the council. Ed.

* In the original, "the great firebrand." Dr. Grey.

† In the History of his Troubles and Trial. Dr. Grey.

(3.) This Dr. Grey denies, and says, "that he pleaded the king's special pardon. The doctor confounds here two different matters. The act of oblivion was pleaded by his grace, before the trial came on, to cover himself from the charge of the Scots commissioners; the king's pardon was produced when the trial was over, in bar of the ordinance passed for his execution. Mr. Neal, in which he is supported by the authority of Clarendon, speaks of the former. Lord Clarendon, whom Dr. Grey quotes, speaks of the latter. The reader will not deem it generous in the doctor to impeach Mr. Neal's veracity on the ground of his own mistake. Ed.

‡ Collier's Eccl. Hist. vol. 2. p. 760.

the government; that he was the only man that had advanced those, who, together with himself, had been the authors of all the miseries the nation now groaned under. That he had managed all the projects that had been set on foot for these ten years past, and had condescended so low as to deal in tobacco, by which thousands of poor people had been turned out of their trades, for which they served an apprenticeship; that he had been charged in this house, upon very strong proof, with designs to subvert the government, and alter the Protestant religion in this kingdom, as well as in Scotland; and there is scarce any grievance or complaint comes before the house, wherein he is not mentioned, like an angry wasp, leaving his sting in the bottom of every thing." He therefore moved, that the charge of the Scots commissioners might be supported by an impeachment of their own; and, that the question might now be put, whether the archbishop had been guilty of high treason? Which being voted, Mr. Hollis was immediately sent up to the bar of the house of lords to impeach him in the name of all the commons of England, and to desire, that his person might be sequestered, and that in convenient time they would bring up the particulars of their charge; upon which his grace, being commanded to withdraw, stood up in his place and said, "that he was heartily sorry for the offence taken against him, but humbly desired their lordships to look upon the whole course of his life, which was such, as that he was persuaded not one man in the house of commons did believe in his heart that he was a traitor." To which the earl of Essex replied, "that it was a high reflection upon the whole house of commons, to suppose that they would charge him with a crime which themselves did not believe." After this his grace withdrew, and being called in again, was delivered to the usher of the black rod, to be kept in safe custody till the house of commons should deliver in their articles of impeachment.

Upon the 26th of February Mr. Pym, Mr. Hampden, and Mr. Maynard, by order of the commons, went up to the lords, and at the bar of that house presented their lordships with fourteen articles, in maintenance of their former charge of high treason against the archbishop, which were read, his grace being present.

In the first, he is charged with endeavouring to subvert

the constitution, by introducing an arbitrary power of government, without any limitation or rule of law. In the second, he is charged with procuring sermons to be preached, and other pamphlets to be printed, in which the authority of parliaments is denied, and the absolute power of the king asserted to be agreeable to the law of God. The third article charges him with interrupting the course of justice, by messages, threatenings, and promises, to the judges. The fourth, with selling justice in his own person, under colour of his ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and with advising his majesty to sell places of judicature, contrary to law. In the fifth, he is charged with the canons and oath imposed on the subject by the late convocation. In the sixth, with robbing the king of supremacy, by denying the ecclesiastical jurisdiction to be derived from the crown. In the seventh, with bringing in Popish doctrines, opinions, and ceremonies, contrary to the articles of the church, and cruelly persecuting those who opposed them. In the eighth, he is charged with promoting persons to the highest and best preferments in the church, who are corrupt in doctrine and manners. In the ninth, with employing such for his domestic chaplains, as he knew to be popishly affected, and committing to them the licensing of books; whereby such writings have been published as have been scandalous to the Protestant religion. The tenth article charges him with sundry attempts to reconcile the church of England with the church of Rome. The eleventh, with discountenancing of preaching, and with silencing, depriving, imprisoning, and banishing, sundry godly and orthodox ministers. The twelfth, with dividing the church of England from the foreign Protestant churches. The thirteenth, with being the author of all the late disturbances between England and Scotland. And the last, with endeavouring to bereave the kingdom of the legislative power, by alienating the king's mind from his parliaments.

At the delivery of these articles Mr. Pym declared, that the commons reserved to themselves the liberty of presenting some additional articles, by which they intended to make their charge more particular and certain, as to the time and other circumstances, and prayed their lordships to put the cause into as quick a forwardness as they could.

When the archbishop had heard the articles read, he made

his obeisance to the house, and said, "that it was a great and heavy charge, and that he was unworthy to live if it could be made good; however, it was yet but in generals, and generals made a great noise, but were no proof. For human frailties he could not excuse himself, but for corruption in the least degree, he feared no accuser that would speak truth. But that which went nearest him, was that he was thought false in his religion, as if he should profess with the church of England, and have his heart at Rome." He then besought their lordships that he might enlarge himself, and so made a short reply to each article, which consisted in an absolute denial of the whole. The lords voted him to the Tower; whither he was carried in Mr. Maxwell's coach through the city, on Monday March 1. It was designed he should have passed incognito; but an apprentice in Newgate-street happening to know him raised the mob, which surrounded the coach, and followed him with huzzas and insults till he got within the Tower-gate. Indeed, such was the universal hatred of all ranks and orders of men against this insolent prelate, for his cruel usage of those who had fallen into his hands in the time of his prosperity, that no man's fall in the whole kingdom was so unlamented as his. His grace being lodged in the Tower, thought it his interest to be quiet, without so much as moving the lords to be brought to a trial, or putting in his answer to the articles of impeachment, till the commons, after two or three years, exhibited their additional articles, and moved the peers to appoint a day for his trial.

Before the archbishop was confined, he had the mortification to see most of the church and state prisoners released; November 16, the bishop of Lincoln was discharged from his imprisonment in the Tower, and his fine remitted. Next day being a public fast he appeared in the Abbey-church at Westminster, and officiated as dean. When he resumed his seat in the house of lords, he behaved with more temper than either the king or the archbishop could expect; whereupon his majesty sent for him, and endeavoured to gain him over to the court, by promising to make him full satisfaction for his past sufferings; in order to which his majesty commanded all the judgments that were entered against him to be discharged, and within a twelvemonth translated him to the archbishopric of York, with leave to hold his

deanery of Westminster in *commendam* for three years: the bishop therefore never complained to the house of his sufferings, nor petitioned for satisfaction.

Mr. Prynne, Mr. Burton, and Dr. Bastwick, being remanded from the several islands to which they had been confined upon their humble petition to the house of commons, were met some miles out of town by great numbers of people on horseback with rosemary and bays in their hats, and escorted into the city in a sort of triumph, with loud acclamations for their deliverance; and a few weeks after, the house came to the following resolutions: "That the several judgments against them were illegal, unjust, and against the liberty of the subject; that their several fines be remitted; that they be restored to their several professions; and that, for reparation of their losses, Mr. Burton ought to have 6,000*l.* and Mr. Prynne and Dr. Bastwick 5,000*l.* each, out of the estates of the archbishop of Canterbury, the high-commissioners, and those lords who had voted against them in the star-chamber;" but the confusion of the times prevented the payment of the money.

Dr. Leighton was released about the same time, and his fine of 10,000*l.* remitted: the reading his petition drew tears from the house, being to this effect:

"The humble petition of Alexander Leighton, prisoner in the Fleet,

"Humbly sheweth,

"That on February 17, 1630, he was apprehended coming from sermon by a high-commission warrant, and dragged along the street with bills and staves to London-house. That the jailer of Newgate being sent for, clapped him in irons, and carried him with a strong power into a loathsome and ruinous dog-hole, full of rats and mice, that had no light but a little grate, and the roof being uncovered, the snow and rain beat in upon him, having no bedding, nor place to make a fire, but the ruins of an old smoky chimney. In this woful place he was shut up for fifteen weeks, nobody being suffered to come near him, till at length his wife only was admitted.

"That the fourth day after his commitment the pursuivant, with a mighty multitude, came to his house to search

for Jesuits' books, and used his wife in such a barbarous and inhuman manner as he is ashamed to express; that they rifled every person and place, holding a pistol to the breast of a child of five years old, threatening to kill him if he did not discover the books; that they broke open chests, presses, boxes, and carried away every thing, even household stuff, apparel, arms, and other things; that at the end of fifteen weeks he was served with a subpœna, on an information laid against him by sir Robert Heath, attorney-general, whose dealing with him was full of cruelty and deceit; but he was then sick, and, in the opinion of four physicians, thought to be poisoned, because all his hair and skin came off; that in the height of this sickness the cruel sentence was passed upon him mentioned in the year *1630*, and executed November 26 following, when he received thirty-six stripes upon his naked back with a threefold cord, his hands being tied to a stake, and then stood almost two hours in the pillory in the frost and snow, before he was branded in the face, his nose slit, and his ears cut off: that after this he was carried by water to the Fleet, and shut up in such a room that he was never well, and after eight years was turned into the common jail." The house voted him satisfaction for his sufferings; but it does not appear that he actually received any, except being keeper of Lambeth-house as a prison, for which he must be very unfit, being now in the seventy second year of his age, and worn out with poverty, weakness, and pain.

Besides those aforenamed, there were likewise set at liberty, Dr. Osbaldeston, one of the prebendaries of Westminster; the reverend Mr. Henry Wilkinson, B. D. of Magdalen-hall, Oxford, Mr. Smith, Wilson, Small, Cooper, and Brewer, who had been in prison fourteen years;* Mr. George Walker, who had been committed for preaching a sermon October 11, 1628, at St. John the Evangelist's, London, and detained four weeks in the hands of a messenger, to whom he paid 20*l.* fees.† This gentleman after his prosecution in the star-chamber, had been shut up ten weeks in the Gate-house, and at last compelled to enter into a bond of 1,000*l.* to confine himself prisoner in his brother's house at Chiswick, where he continued till this time, his parsonage being sequestered; and in general all who were

* Nalson's Col. p. 571. † Ibid. p. 570.

confined by the high-commission were released, passing their words to be forthcoming whenever they should be called for.

The imprisonment of the above-mentioned gentlemen being declared illegal, it is natural to imagine the house would make some inquiry after their prosecutors. About the latter end of January, Dr. Cosins, prebendary of Durham, and afterward bishop of the diocess, was sent for into custody, on account of the superstitious innovations which he had introduced into that cathedral.* The doctor in his answer denied the whole charge, and as to the particulars, he replied, that the marble altar with cherubim was set up before he was prebendary of the church ;† that he did not approve of the image of God the Father, and that to his knowledge there was no such representation in the church at Durham; that the crucifix with a blue cap and golden beard, was mistaken for the top of bishop Hatfield's tomb, which had been erected many years before; that there were but two candles on the communion-table; and, that no more were used on Candlemas-night than in the Christmas holidays; that he did not forbid the singing the psalms in metre ;‡ nor direct the singing of the anthem to the three kings of Colen ;§ nor use a consecrated knife at the sacrament. The lords were so far satisfied with the doctor's answer, as not to commit him at present ;‖ but the commons having voted him unfit to hold any ecclesiastical promotion, the doctor, foreseeing the storm that was coming upon the church, wisely withdrew into France,¶ where he

* Nalson's Collection, p. 273.

† But when Smart was one of the chapter; and that many of the things objected to himself were introduced while his accuser was prebendary. Dr. Grey from Collyer.—Ed.

‡ But used to sing them himself, with the people at morning-prayer.—Ed.

§ But ordered it, on his first coming to the cathedral, to be cut out of the old song-book belonging to the choristers: and no such anthem had been sung in the choir during his being there, nor, as far as his inquiry could reach, for threescore years before. Dr. Grey from Collyer.—Ed.

‖ The doctor's answer was entered on the rolls of parliament, and made good before the lords by himself, and by the witness that Smart and his son-in-law produced against him. Upon this Smart's lawyer told him, at the bar of the house of lords, that he was ashamed of the complaint, and refused to proceed in the support of it. Collyer also says, that many of the lords declared, that Smart had abused the house of commons with a groundless complaint against Cosins; who, by an order from the lords, delivered to him by the earl of Warwick, had liberty to go where he pleased. Eccles. History, vol 2. p. 798.—Ed.

¶ He fixed his residence in Paris, where he was appointed chaplain to the Protestant part of queen Henrietta's family. Many advantageous offers were made him, to tempt him over to the communion of the church of Rome; and he was also attacked

behaved discreetly and prudently till the Restoration, being softened in his principles by age and sufferings.

Dr. Matthew Wren, late bishop of Norwich, and now of Ely, having been remarkably severe against the Puritan clergy in his diocesses, the inhabitants of Ipswich drew up a petition against him, and presented it to the house December 22, 1640;* upon which the committee of parliament exhibited a charge against him, consisting of twenty-five articles relating to the late innovations. It was carried up to the lords by sir Thomas Widdrington, and sets forth, that during the time of his being bishop of Norwich, which was about two years, fifty ministers had been excommunicated, suspended, and deprived, "for not reading the second service at the communion-table; for not reading the book of sports; for using conceived prayers before the afternoon sermon," &c. and that by his rigorous severities many of his majesty's subjects, to the number of three thousand, had removed themselves, their families and estates, to Holland, and set up their manufactories there, to the great prejudice of the trade of this kingdom. I do not find that the bishop put in a particular answer to these articles, nor was he taken into custody, but only gave bond for his appearance. Some time after the commons voted him unfit to hold any ecclesiastical preferment in the church; and both lords and commons joined in a petition to the king, to remove the said bishop from his person and service; after which he was imprisoned, with the rest of the protesting bishops. Upon his release he retired to his house at Downham in the isle of Ely, from whence he was taken by a party of parliament soldiers and conveyed to the Tower, where he continued a patient prisoner till the end of the year 1659, without being brought to his trial, or admitted to bail.

Complaints were made against several other bishops and clergymen, as, Dr. Pierce bishop of Bath and Wells, Dr. Montague bishop of Norwich, Dr. Owen bishop of Landaff, and Dr. Manwaring bishop of St. David's; but the house had too many affairs upon their hands to attend to their

by threats of assassinations but continued an unshaken Protestant. The arts of the Papists succeeded with his only son, whom they prevailed with to embrace the Catholic faith, and to take upon him religious orders. This was very heavy affliction to his father, who on this ground left his estate from him. [illegible] Hist. of England, vol. [illegible] p. [illegible] 1, 8vo. and Nelson's Collections, vol. [illegible] p. [illegible]

* Nelson's Collections, p. [illegible]

prosecutions. Of the inferior clergy, Dr. Stone, Chaffin, Aston, Jones, and some others, who had been instruments of severity in the late times, were voted unfit for ecclesiastical promotions. Dr. Layfield, archdeacon of Essex, pleaded his privilege as a member of convocation, according to an old Popish statute of Henry VI.* but the committee overruled it, and voted the doctor into custody of the serjeant at arms, Dr. Pocklington, canon of Windsor, and prebendary of Peterborough, was complained of for two books, one entitled the Christian Altar; the other, Sunday no Sabbath; which had been licensed by Dr. Bray, one of the archbishop's chaplains. The doctor acknowledged his offence at the bar of the house, confessed that he had not examined the books with that caution that he ought, and made a public recantation in the church of Westminster; but Pocklington, refusing to recant about thirty false propositions, which the bishop of Lincoln had collected out of his books, was sentenced by the lord-keeper "to be deprived of his ecclesiastical preferments; to be for ever disabled to hold any place or dignity in the church or commonwealth; never to come within the verge of his majesty's court; and his books to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman in the city of London, and the two universities." Both the doctors died soon after. The number of petitions that were sent up to the committee of religion from all parts of the country against their clergy is incredible;† some complaining of their superstitious impositions, and others of the immorality of their lives, and neglect of their cures; which shews the little esteem they had among the people, who were weary of their yoke, regarding them no longer than they were under the terror of their excommunications.

* There was no particular propriety, rather it was, as Dr. Grey intimates, somewhat invidious in Mr. Neal, thus to characterize this statute, relative to the privilege of the clergy coming to convocation, as it must, being of so ancient a date, necessarily be Popish; as one fourth part of the statute law, and there are various instances of its being enforced since the Reformation, and even in the present century; of which Dr. Grey gives ample proof.—Ed.

† Dr. Grey judges it not at all incredible; because, on the authority of lord Clarendon, he adds, unfair methods of obtaining petitions were used in those times of iniquity and confusion. The clergyman's act, of which bishop complains, was procuring a petition drawn up in modest and decent terms, and then cutting it off and substituting another of a different stamp and spirit, and annexing it to the list of subscribers. This practice bishop supposed did not go on to be continued in the former terms. A virtuous mind has too often occasion to be surprised, and shocked, at the arts which party principles and views can adopt. History of the Rebellion, vol. I. p. 3. L.

Such was the spirit of the populace, that it was difficult to prevent their outrunning authority, and tearing down in a tumultuous manner what they were told had been illegally set up. At St. Saviour's Southwark, the mob pulled down the rails about the communion-table. At Halstead in Essex, they tore the surplice, and abused the service-book; nay, when the house of commons was assembled at St. Margaret's Westminster, as the priest was beginning his second service at the communion-table, some at the lower end of the church began a psalm, which was followed by the congregation, so that the minister was forced to desist. But to prevent these seditious practices for the future, the lords and commons passed a very severe sentence on the rioters, and published the following order, bearing date January 16, 1640—1, appointing it to be read in all the parish-churches of London, Westminster, and the borough of Southwark, viz. "That divine service shall be performed as it is appointed by the acts of parliament of this realm; and that all such as disturb that wholesome order shall be severely punished by law." But then it was added, "that the parsons, vicars, and curates, of the several parishes, shall forbear to introduce any rites or ceremonies that may give offence, otherwise than those which are established by the laws of the land." The design of this proviso was to guard against the late innovations, and particular, against the clergy's refusing the sacrament to such as would not receive it kneeling at the rails.

There was such a violent clamour against the high clergy, that they could hardly officiate according to the late injunctions, without being affronted, nor walk the streets in their habits, says Nalson, without being reproached as Popish priests, Cæsar's friends, &c. The reputation of the liturgy began to sink; reading prayers was called a lifeless form of worship, and a quenching the Holy Spirit, whose assistances are promised in the matter, as well as the manner of our prayers; besides, the nation being in a crisis, it was thought impossible that the old forms should be suitable to the exigency of the times, or to the circumstances of particular persons, who might desire a share in the devotions of the church. Those ministers, therefore, who prayed with fervency and devotion,* in words of their own conception, [illegible] either

* Dr. Grey gives some specimens of that, which [illegible]

to the sermon that was preached, or to the present urgency of affairs, had crowded and attentive auditories, while the ordinary service of the church was deserted as cold, formal, and without spirit.

The discipline of the church being relaxed, the Brownists or Independents, who had assembled in private, and shifted from house to house for twenty or thirty years, resumed their courage, and shewed themselves in public. We have given an account of their origin, from Mr. Robinson and Mr. Jacob, in the year 1616, the last of whom was succeeded by Mr. John Lathorp, formerly a clergyman in Kent, but having renounced his orders, he became pastor of this little society. In his time the congregation was discovered by Tomlinson, the bishop's pursuivant, April 29, 1632, at the house of Mr. Humphry Barnet, a brewer's clerk, in Blackfriars, where forty-two of whom were apprehended, and only eighteen escaped: of those that were taken, some were confined in the Clink, others in New-prison and the Gate-house, where they continued about two years, and were then released upon bail, except Mr. Lathorp, for whom no favour could be obtained; he therefore petitioned the king for liberty to depart the kingdom, which being granted, he went, in the year 1634, to New England, with about thirty of his followers. Mr. Lathorp was a man of learning, and of a meek and quiet spirit, but met with some uneasiness, upon occasion of one of his people carrying his child to be rebaptized by the parish-minister; some of the congregation insisting, that it should be baptized, because the other administration was not valid; but when the question was put, it was carried in the negative, and resolved by the majority, not to make any declaration at present, whether or no parish-churches were true churches? Upon this some of the more rigid, and others who were dissatisfied about the lawfulness of infant baptism, desired their dismission, which

in the piece entitled "Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence." The improved taste of this age, and rational devotion, revolt at them. But Dr. Grey did not reflect, that the offensive improprieties, which he exposes, were not peculiar to extemporary prayer, nor to the Puritans; they were agreeable to the fashion of the age, and incorporated themselves with the precomposed prayers published by royal command. The thanksgiving for victory in the north, 1633, affords an instance of this. "Lord! look to the righteousness of our cause. See the seamless coat of thy Son torn, the throne of thine Anointed trampled on, thy church invaded by sacrilege, and thy people miserably deceived with lies." Robinson's Translation of Claude's Essay on the Composition of a Sermon, vol. 2. p. 1[illegible]-1[illegible].

was granted them; these set up by themselves, and chose Mr. Jesse their minister, who laid the foundation of the first Baptist congregation* that I have met with in England. But the rest renewed their covenant, "to walk together in the ways of God, so far as he had made them known or should make them known to them, and to forsake all false ways." And so steady were they to their vows, that hardly an instance can be produced, of one that deserted to the church by the severest prosecutions.

Upon Mr. Lathorp's retiring into New England, the congregation chose for their pastor the famous Mr. Canne,† author of the marginal references in the Bible, who after he had preached to them in private houses for a year or two, was driven by the severity of the times into Holland, and became pastor of the Brownist congregation at Amsterdam.

After Mr. Canne, Mr. Samuel Howe undertook the pastoral care of this little flock; he was a man of learning, and printed a small treatise, called, "The sufficiency of the Spirit's teaching."‡ But not being enough upon his guard in conversation he laid himself open to the informers, by whose means he was cited into the spiritual courts, and excommunicated; hereupon he absconded, till being at last taken, he

* According to Crosby this is a mistake, for there were three Baptist churches in England before that of Mr. Jesse. One formed by the separation of many persons from Mr. Lathorp's in 1638, before he left England. Another by a second separation from the same church in 1640, the members of which joined themselves to Mr. Spilsbury. And a third, which originated in 1639, with Mr. Green and captain Spencer, whom Mr. Paul Hobson joined. Crosby's History of the English Baptists, vol. I. p. 41, 42.—Ed.

† Crosby says, that the church, of which Mr. Canne, Mr. Samuel Howe, and Mr. Stephen More, were successively pastors, was *constituted* and planted by Mr. Hubbard. And it is not certain, whether Mr. Canne was a Baptist or not. He was the author of three sets of notes on the Bible, which accompanied three different editions of it. One printed by him at Amsterdam, 1617; which refers to a former one, and professes to add "many Hebraisms, diversitie of readings, with consonancie of parallel scriptures, taken out of the last annotations, and all set in due order and place." Another is commonly known, and has been often reprinted. There was also an impression of it at Amsterdam, 1664. A new edition of the Bible of 1664, is a desideratum. Two Treatises of Henry Ainsworth, prof. p. 35, note; and Crosby, vol. I. p. 10. Ed.

‡ The treatise here mentioned, we are informed, displayed strength of genius, but was written by a cobbler; as appears by the following recommendatory lines prefixed to it:

> What How? how now? hath How such learning found,
> To throw art's curious image to the ground?
> Cambridge and Oxford may their glory now
> Veil to a cobbler, if they knew but How.

This treatise was founded on 2 Pet. iii. 16, and designed to show not the insufficiency only of human learning to the purposes of religion, but that it was dangerous and hurtful. So that Mr. Neal was mistaken in speaking of its author as a man of learning. Crosby, vol. I. p. 39, note.—Ed.

was shut up in close prison, where he died. His friends would have buried him in Shoreditch churchyard, but, being excommunicated, the officers of the parish would not admit it, so they buried him in a piece of ground at Anniseed Clear, where many of his congregation were buried after him.*

Upon Mr. Howe's death the little church was forced to take up with a layman, Mr. Stephen More, a citizen of London, of good natural parts, and of considerable substance in the world; he had been their deacon for some years, and in the present exigency accepted of the pastoral office, to the apparent hazard of his estate and liberty. However, the face of affairs beginning now to change, this poor congregation, which had subsisted almost by a miracle for above twenty-four years, shifting from place to place, to avoid the notice of the public, ventured to open their doors in Dead-man's place, in Southwark, January 18, 1610—1. Mr. Fuller calls them a congregation of Anabaptists, who were met together to the number of eighty; but by their journal or church-book, an abstract of which is now before me, it appears to be Mr. More's congregation of Independents, who, being assembled in Dead-man's place on the Lord's day, were disturbed by the marshal of the King's-bench, and most of them committed to the Clink-prison. Next morning six or seven of the men were carried before the house of lords, and charged with denying the king's supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, and with preaching in separate congregations, contrary to the statute of the 35th of Eliz. The latter they confessed, and as to the former, they declared to the house, that "they could acknowledge no other head of the church but Christ; that they apprehended no prince on earth had power to make laws to bind the conscience; and that such laws as were contrary to the laws of God, ought not to be obeyed; but that they disowned all foreign power and jurisdiction." Such a declaration a twelvemonth ago might have cost them their ears; but the house, instead of remitting them to the ecclesiastical courts, dismissed them with a gentle reprimand, and three or four of the members came out of curiosity to their assembly next Lord's day, to hear their minister preach, and to see him administer the [illegible], and were so well satisfied, that they contributed to [illegible] collection for the poor.

* Crosby's History of the English Baptists, vol. 1. p. 10.

To return to the parliament. It has been observed, that one of their first resolutions was to reduce the powers of the spiritual courts. The old Popish canons, which were the laws by which they proceeded (as far as they had not been controlled by the common law or particular statutes), were such a labyrinth, that when the subject was got into the commons he knew not how to defend himself, nor which way to get out. The kings of England had always declined a reformation of the ecclesiastical laws, though a plan had been laid before them ever since the reign of king Edward VI. But the grievance was now become insufferable, by the numbers of illegal imprisonments, deprivations, and fines levied upon the subject in the late times, for crimes not actionable in the courts of Westminster-hall; it was necessary therefore to bring the jurisdiction of those courts to a parliamentary standard, but, till this could not be accomplished by a new law, all that could be done was to vote down the late innovations, which had very little effect; and therefore on the 23d of January the house of commons ordered commissioners to be sent into all the counties to demolish, and remove out of churches and chapels, all "*images*, altars, or *tables turned altarwise, crucifixes, superstitious* pictures, and *other monuments and relics of idolatry*," agreeably to the *injunctions of king Edward VI. and queen Elizabeth*. How far the house of commons, who are but one branch of the legislature, may appoint commissioners to put the laws in execution, without the concurrence of the other two, is so very questionable, that I will not take upon me to determine.

The university of Cambridge having complained of the oaths and subscriptions imposed upon young students at their matriculation, as subscribing to the Book of Common Prayer, and to the thirty-nine articles, the house of commons voted, "that the statute made twenty-seven years ago in the university of Cambridge, imposing upon young scholars a subscription, according to the thirty-sixth canon of 1603, is against law and the liberty of the subject, and ought not to be imposed upon any students or graduates whatsoever." About five months forwards they passed the same resolution for Oxford, which was not unreasonable, because the universities had not an unlimited power, by the thirty-sixth canon, to call upon all their students to subscribe, but

only upon such lecturers or readers of divinity whom they had a privilege of licensing; and to this I conceive the last words of the canon refer; "If either of the universities offend therein, we leave them to the danger of the law and his majesty's censure."

And it ought to be remembered, that all the proceedings of the house of commons this year, in punishing delinquents, and all their votes and resolutions about the circumstances of public worship, had no other view, than the cutting off those illegal additions and innovations, which the superstition of the late times had introduced, and reducing the discipline of the church to the standard of the statute law. No man was punished for acting according to law; but the displeasure of the house ran high against those, who, in their public ministrations, or in their ecclesiastical courts, had bound those things upon the subject which were either contrary to the laws of the land, or about which the laws were altogether silent.

CHAP. VII.

THE ANTIQUITY OF LITURGIES, AND OF THE EPISCOPAL ORDER, DEBATED BETWEEN BISHOP HALL AND SMECTYMNUUS. PETITIONS FOR AND AGAINST THE HIERARCHY. ROOT AND BRANCH PETITION. THE MINISTERS' PETITION FOR REFORMATION. SPEECHES UPON THE PETITIONS. PROCEEDINGS AGAINST PAPISTS.

THE debates in parliament concerning the English liturgy and hierarchy engaged the attention of the whole nation, and revived the controversy without doors. The press being open, great numbers of anonymous pamphlets appeared against the establishment, not without indecent and provoking language, under these and the like titles; Prelatical Episcopacy not from the Apostles. Lord Bishops not the Lord's Bishops. Short View of the Prelatical Church of England. A Comparison between the Liturgy and the Mass-book. Service Book no better than a Mess of Pottage, &c.—Lord Brook attacked the order of bishops

in a treatise of the "Nature of episcopacy," wherein he reflects in an ungenerous manner upon the low pedigree of the present bench, as if nothing except a noble descent could qualify men to sit among the peers. Several of the bishops vindicated their pedigree and families, as, bishop Williams, Moreton, Curle, Cooke, Owen, &c. and archbishop Usher defended the order, in a treatise entitled, "The apostolical institution of episcopacy;"* but then by a bishop his lordship understood no more than a stated president over an assembly of presbyters, which the Puritans of these times were willing to admit. The most celebrated writer on the side of the establishment, was the learned and pious bishop Hall, who, at the request of archbishop Laud, had published a treatise entitled, Episcopacy of Divine Right, as has been related. This reverend prelate, upon the gathering of the present storm, appeared a second time in its defence, in "An humble remonstrance to the high court of parliament;" and sometime after, in "A defence of that remonstrance," in vindication of the antiquity of liturgies and of diocesan episcopacy.

The bishop's remonstrance was answered by a celebrated treatise under the title of Smectymnuus, a fictitious word made up of the initial letters of the names of the authors, viz. Stephen Marshal, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstow. When the bishop had replied to their book, these divines published a vindication of their answer to the "Humble remonstrance;" which, being an appeal to the legislature on both sides, may be supposed to contain the merits of the controversy, and will therefore deserve the reader's attention.

The debate was upon these two heads;

1. Of the antiquity of liturgies, or forms of prayer.
2. Of the apostolical institution of diocesan episcopacy.

1. The bishop begins with liturgies, by which he under-

* Nalson, in his Collections, vol. 2. p. 279, 280, and after him, Collyer, Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2. p. 808, have abridged the arguments of this piece; but these abstracts do not show, as Dr. Grey would intimate, the extent of jurisdiction, or the nature of the power, according to bishop Usher's idea, exercised by the primitive bishops. They go to prove only a superiority to elders: and by a quotation from Beza, it should seem that this prelate, as Mr. Neal says, meant by a bishop only a president of the presbytery of a place or district. The Presbyterians are charged with misrepresenting the bishop's opinion, and with printing a faulty and surreptitious copy of his book. If this were done knowingly and designedly, it must rank with such pious acts as deserve severe censure. Dr. Grey.—Edit.

stands "certain prescribed and limited forms of prayer, composed for the public service of the church, and appointed to be read at all times of public worship." The antiquity of these, his lordship derives down from Moses, by an uninterrupted succession, to the present time. "God's people (says he) ever since Moses's day, constantly practised a set form, and put put it ever to the times of the gospel. Our blessed Saviour, and his gracious forerunner, taught a direct form of prayer. When Peter and John went up to the temple at the ninth hour of prayer, we know the prayer wherein they joined was not of an extempore and sudden conception, but of a regular prescription: and the evangelical church ever since thought it could never better improve her peace and happiness, than in composing those religious models of invocation and thanksgiving, which they have traduced unto us, as the liturgies of St. James, Basil, and Chrysostom, and which, though in some places corrupted, serve to prove the thing itself."

Smectymnuus replies, that if there had been any liturgies in the times of the first and most venerable antiquity, the great inquiries after them would have produced them to the world before this time; but that there were none in the Christian church is evident from Tertullian in his Apology, cap. 30, where he says, the Christians of those times, in their public assemblies, prayed "sine monitore quia de pectore," without any prompter except their own hearts. And in his treatise of prayer, he adds, there are some things to be asked "according to the occasions of every man." St. Austin says the same thing, ep. 121. "It is free to ask the same things that are desired in the Lord's prayer, *aliis atque aliis verbis*, sometimes in one manner of expression, and sometimes in another." And before this, Justin Martyr in his Apology says, ὁ προεστώς, the president, or he that instructed the people, prayed according to his ability, or as well as he could. Nor was this liberty of prayer taken away till the times when the Arian and Pelagian heresies* invaded the

* It is to be wished that Mr. Neal had used the word opinions instead of heresies. It was indeed the style of the times, when he wrote, and of many preceding ages; but the application of the term conveys not only the idea of error, but of error accompanied with malignity of mind and guilt. There may be great errors, without any of that criminality, which the word heresy, in the Scripture meaning of it, implies. Berulus pronouncing opinions, heresies is rather the language of authority and infallibility than of the inquirer after truth, and prejudices the mind.—Ed.

church; it was then first ordained, that none should pray "pro arbitrio, sed semper easdem preces;" that they should not use the liberty which they had hitherto practised, but should always keep to one form of prayer. Concil. Laod. can. 18. Still this was a form of their own composing, as appears by a canon of the council of Carthage, anno 397, which gives this reason for it, "ut nemo in precibus vel patrem pro filio, vel filium pro patre nominet, et cum altari adsistitur semper ad patrem dirigatur oratio; et quicunque sibi preces aliunde describit, non iis utatur nisi prius eas cum fratribus instructioribus contulerit;" i. e. "that none in their prayers might mistake the Father for the Son, or the Son for the Father; and that when they assist at the altar, prayer might be always directed to the Father. And whosoever composes any different forms, let him not make use of them till he has first consulted with his more learned brethren." It appears from hence, that there was no uniform prescribed liturgy at this time in the church, but that the more ignorant priests might make use of forms of their own composing, provided they consulted their more learned brethren; till at length it was ordained at the council of Milan, anno 416, that none should use set forms of prayer, except such as were approved in a synod. They go on to transcribe, from Justin Martyr and Tertullian, the manner of public worship in their times, which was this; first the Scriptures were read; after reading, followed an exhortation to the practice and imitation of what was read; then all rose up and joined in prayer; after this they went to the sacrament, in the beginning whereof the president of the assembly poured out prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people said Amen; then followed the distribution of the elements, and a collection of alms. This was Justin Martyr's liturgy or service, and Tertullian's is the same, only he mentions their beginning with prayer before reading the Scriptures, and their love-feasts, which only opened and concluded with prayer, and were celebrated with singing of psalms. Although the Socinians admit that our blessed Saviour taught his disciples a form of prayer, yet they deny that he designed to confine them to the use of those words only, nor did the primitive church so understand it, as has been proved from St. Austin. The pretended liturgies of St. James, Basil,

and St. Chrysostom, are of little weight in this argument, as being allowed by the bishop, and the most learned critics both Protestants and Papists, to be full of forgeries and spurious insertions. Upon the whole, therefore, they challenge his lordship to produce any one genuine liturgy, used in the Christian church for three hundred years after Christ.*

From the antiquity of liturgies in general, the bishop descends to a more particular commendation of that which is established in the church of England, as that it was drawn up by wise and good men with great deliberation; that it had been sealed with the blood of martyrs; and was selected out of ancient models, not Roman but Christian.

In answer to which those divines appeal to the proclamation of Edward VI. wherein the original of it is published to the world. The statute mentions four different forms then in use, out of which a uniform office was to be collected, viz. the use of Sarum, of Bangor, of York, and of Lincoln; all which were Roman rather than Christian; they admit his lordship's other encomiums of the English liturgy, but affirm that it was still imperfect, and in many places offensive to tender consciences.

The good bishop, after all, seems willing to compromise the difference about prayer. "Far be it from me (says his lordship) to dishearten any good Christian from the use of conceived prayer in his private devotions, and upon occasion also in the public. I would hate to be guilty of pouring so much water upon the spirit, to which I should gladly add oil rather. No, let the full soul freely pour out itself in gracious expressions of its holy thoughts into the bosom of the Almighty; let both the sudden flashes of our quick

* Bishop Burnet says, [Hist. Ref. part 2. p. 72.] that it was in the fourth century that the liturgies of St. James, St. Basil, &c. were first mentioned; that the council of Laodicea appointed the same prayers to be used mornings and evenings, but that these forms were left to the discretion of every bishop; nor was it made the subject of any public consultation till St. Austin's time, when, in their dealing with heretics, they found they took advantage from some of the prayers that were in some churches; upon which it was ordered, that there should be no public prayers used but by common advice. Formerly, says the bishop, the worship of God was a pure and simple thing, and so it continued, till superstition had so infected the church, that those forms were thought too naked, unless they were put under more artificial rules, and dressed up with much ceremony. In every age there were notable additions made, and all the writers almost in the eighth and ninth centuries employed their fancies to find out mystical significations for every rite that was then used, till at length there were so many missals, breviaries, rituals, pontificals, pontoises, pies, graduals, antiphonals, psalteries, hours, and a great many more, that the understanding how to officiate was become so hard a piece of trade, that it was not to be learned without long practice.

ejaculations, and the constant flames of our more fixed conceptions, mount up from the altar of a zealous heart unto the throne of grace; and if there be some stops or solecisms, in the fervent utterance of our private wants, these are so far from being offensive, that they are the most pleasing music to the ears of that God unto whom our prayers come; let them be broken off with sobs and sighs, and incongruities of our delivery, our good God is no otherways affected to this imperfect elocution, than an indulgent parent is to the clipped and broken language of his dear child, which is more delightful to him than any other's smooth oratory. This is not to be opposed in another, by any man that hath found the true operations of this grace in himself——" "What I have professed concerning conceived prayers, is that which I have ever allowed, ever practised, both in private and public. God is a free spirit, and so should ours be, in pouring out our voluntary devotions upon all occasions; nothing hinders but that this liberty and a public liturgy should be good friends, and go hand in hand together; and whosoever would forcibly separate them, let them bear their own blame——the over-rigorous pressing of the liturgy, to the justling out of preaching or conceived prayers, was never intended either by the lawmakers, or moderate governors of the church." If the bishops, while in power, had practised according to these pious and generous principles, their affairs could not have been brought to such a dangerous crisis at this time.

2. The other point in debate between the bishop and his adversaries, related to the superior order of bishops. And here the controversy was not about the name, which signifies in the Greek no more than an overseer, but about the office and character; the Smectymnuan divines contended, that a primitive bishop was no other than a parochial pastor, or a preaching presbyter, without pre-eminence or any proper rule over his brethren. His lordship on the other hand affirms, that bishops were originally a "distinct order from presbyters, instituted by the apostles themselves, and invested with the sole power of ordination and ecclesiastical jurisdiction;" that in this sense they are of divine institution, and have continued in the church by an uninterrupted succession to the present time. The bishop enters upon this argument with unusual assurance, bearing down

his adversaries with a torrent of bold and unguarded expressions. His words are these; "This holy calling (meaning the order of bishops as distinct from presbyters) fetches its pedigree from no less than apostolical, and therefore divine institution. Except all histories, all authors fail us, nothing can be more plain than this; out of them we can and do shew on whom the apostles of Christ laid their hands, with an acknowledgment and conveyance of imparity and jurisdiction. We shew what bishops so ordained lived in the times of the apostles, and succeeded each other in their several charges under the eyes and hands of the then living apostles. We shew who immediately succeeded those immediate successors in their several sees, throughout all the regions of the Christian church, and deduce their uninterrupted line through all the following ages to this present day; and if there can be better evidence under heaven for any matter of fact (and, in this cause, matter of fact so derived evinceth matter of right), let episcopacy be for ever abandoned out of God's church.—Again, if we do not shew, out of the genuine and undeniable writings of those holy men who lived both in the times of the apostles and some years after them, and conversed with them as their blessed fellow-labourers, a clear and received distinction both of the names and offices of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, as three distinct subordinate callings in God's church, with an evident specification of the duty and charge belonging to each of them; let this claimed hierarchy be for ever hooted out of the church."*

The bishop admits,† that, in the language of Scripture, bishops and presbyters are the same; that there is a plain identity in their denomination, and that we never find these three orders mentioned together, bishops, presbyters, and deacons; but though there be no distinction of names, his lordship apprehends there is a real distinction and specification of powers; which are,

1. The sole right of ordination.

2. The sole right of spiritual jurisdiction.

1. The sole right of ordination his lordship proves from the words of Paul, 2 Tim. i. 6; "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the laying on of my hands;" and that this power was never communicated to presbyters, from the

* Roman forgeries p. 91. † Defence, p. 47.

words of St. Jerome, by whom ordination is excepted from the office of a presbyter: "quid facit episcopus, quod non facit presbyter, excepta ordinatione." And yet (says his lordship) our English bishops do not appropriate this power to themselves: "Say, brethren, I beseech you after all this noise, what bishops ever undertook to ordain a presbyter alone, or without the concurrent imposition of many hands? This is perpetually and unfailably done by us."

The Smectymnuan divines contend, on the other hand, that bishops and presbyters were originally the same; that ordination to the office of a bishop does not differ from the ordination of a presbyter; that there are no powers conveyed to a bishop from which presbyters are secluded; nor any qualification required in one more than in the other; that admitting Timothy was a proper bishop, which they deny, yet that he was ordained by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery as well as of St. Paul's, 1 Tim. iv. 14. That the original of the order of bishops, was from the presbyters choosing one fro[illegible] among themselves to be stated president in their assemblies, in the second or third century; that St. Jerome declares once and again, that in the days of the apostles, bishops and presbyters were the same; that as low as his [illegible] they had gained nothing but ordination; and that S[illegible]ysostom and Theophylact affirm, that while the apostl[illegible]d, and for some ages after, the names of bishops and pre[illegible]rs were not distinguished. This, say they, is the voice of the most primitive antiquity.* But the Smectymnuans are amazed at his lordship's assertion, that the bishops of the church of England never ordained without presbyters; and that this was so constant a practice, that no instance can be produced of its being done without them. "Strange! (say they) when some of us have been eye-witnesses of many scores who have been ordained by a bishop in his private chapel, without the presence of any presbyter, except his domestic chaplain, who only read prayers. Be-

* In the debate of the house on this head, the authority of that very ancient parchment copy of the Bible in St. James's library, sent by Cyrillus patriarch of Alexandria to king Charles I. being all written in great capital Greek letters, was vouched and asserted by sir Simon D'Ewes, [illegible] antiquary, therein the postscript to the [illegible] Timothy and Titus [illegible] "[illegible] to Timothy, written from [illegible] Titus, written from N[illegible] whence he inferred, that the stylus of Timothy and Titus first bishops of Ephesus and Crete, were the [illegible] bishop or monk, at least five hundred years after Christ. [illegible] vol. 1. p. [illegible]

sides, the bishop's letters of orders make no mention of the assistance of presbyters, but challenge the whole power to themselves, as his lordship had done in his book entitled, Episcopacy of Divine Right, the fifteenth section of which has this title, 'The power of ordination is only in bishops.'"

But the main point upon which the bishop lays the whole stress of the cause is, whether presbyters may ordain without a bishop? For the proof of this, the Smectymnuans produce the author of the comment on the Ephesians, which goes under the name of St. Ambrose, who says, that in Egypt the presbyters ordain if the bishop be not present; so that St. Augustine in the same words; and the chorepiscopus, who was only a presbyters, had power to impose hands, and to ordain within his precincts with the bishop's licence; nay farther, the presbyter of the city of Alexandria, with the bishop's leave, might ordain, as appears from Con. Ancyr. Carit. 3, where it is said, "it is not lawful for chorepiscopi to ordain presbyters or deacons; nor for the presbyters of the city without the bishop's letter, in another parish;" which implies they might do it with the bishop's letter, or perhaps without it, in their own; and Firmilianus says of them who rule in the church, whom he calls "seniores et præpositi;" that is, presbyters as well as bishops, that they had the power of baptizing and of laying on hands in ordaining.*

* It may be some satisfaction to the reader, to see the judgment of other learned men upon this argument, which has broken the bands of brotherly love and charity, between the church of England and all the foreign Protestants that have no bishops.

The learned primate of Ireland, archbishop Usher, in his letter to Dr. Bernard, says, "I have ever declared my opinion to be, that 'episcopus et presbyter gradu tantum differunt, non ordine,' and consequently, that in places where bishops cannot be had, the ordination by presbyters stands valid; but the ordination made by such presbyters as have severed themselves from those bishops to whom they have sworn canonical obedience, I cannot excuse from being schismatical. I think that churches that have no bishops are defective in their government, yet, for the justifying my communion with them (which I do love and honour as true members of the church universal), I do profess if I were in Holland, I should receive the blessed sacrament at the hands of the Dutch, with the like affection as I should from the hands of the French ministers, were I at Charenton." The same most reverend prelate, in his answer to Mr. Baxter, says, "that the king having asked him at the Isle of Wight, whether he found in antiquity, that presbyters alone ordained any? he replied yes, and that he could shew his majesty more, even where presbyters alone successively ordained bishops, and instanced in Jerome's words, (epist. ad Evagrium) of the presbyters of Alexandria choosing and making their own bishops from the days of Mark, till Heraclas and Dionysius." Baxter's Life, p. 206.

This was the constant sense of our first reformers, Cranmer, Pilkington, Jewel, Grindal, Whitgift, &c. and even of Bancroft himself; for when Dr. Andrews, bishop of Ely, moved that the Scots bishops elect might first be ordained presbyters in the year 1610, Bancroft replied there was no need of it, since ordination by presbyters

2. The other branch of power annexed to the episcopal office, is the sole right of spiritual jurisdiction; this the bishop seems in some sort to disclaim: "Who ever (says he) challenged a sole jurisdiction? We willingly grant that presbyters have, and ought to have, jurisdiction within their own charge; and that in all great affairs of the church they ought to be consulted. We admit, that bishops of old had their ecclesiastical council of presbyters; and we still have the same in our deans and chapters; but we say that the superiority of jurisdiction is so in the bishop, that presbyters may not exercise it without him, and that the exercise of external jurisdiction is derived from, by, and under him, to those who exercise it within his diocess." This his lordship proves from several testimonies out of the fathers.

The Smectymnuans agree with his lordship, that in the ancient church, bishops could do nothing without the consent of the clergy; nor in cases of excommunication and absolution without the allowance of the whole body of the church to which the delinquent belonged, as appears from the testimonies of Tertullian and St. Cyprian; but they aver, upon their certain knowledge, that our English bishops have exercised several parts of ecclesiastical jurisdiction without their presbyters. And farther (say they), where, in all antiquity, do we meet with such delegates, as lay-chancellors, commissaries, and others as never received imposition of hands? These offices were not known in those times; nor can any instance be produced of laity or clergy who had them for above four hundred years after Christ.

Upon the whole, allowing that, in the third or fourth century, bishops were a distinct order from presbyters, yet, say these divines, our modern bishops of the church of England differ very widely from them; the primitive bishops were

was valid, upon which the said bishop concurred in their consecration. And yet lower, when the archbishop of Spalato was in England, he desired bishop Morton to reordain a person that had been ordained beyond sea, that he might be more capable of preferment; to which the bishop replied, that it could not be done, [illegible] scandal of the reformed churches, wherein he would have no hand. [illegible] prelate adds, in his Apol. Cathol. that to ordain was the [illegible] To those may be added the testimony of bishop Burnet [illegible] "As for the notion of distinct offices of bishop and presbyter [illegible] to me, and therefore, since I look upon the sacramental action as the highest of sacred performances, I cannot but [illegible] who are [illegible] for them must be of the highest office in the church." [illegible] of the Church of Scotland [illegible]

elected by a free suffrage of the presbyters, but ours by a *congé d'elire* from the king. They did not proceed against criminals but with the consent of their presbyters, and upon the testimony of several witnesses; whereas ours proceed by an oath *ex officio*, by which men are obliged to accuse themselves; the primitive bishops had no lordly titles and dignities, no lay-chancellors, commissaries, and other officials, nor did they engage in secular affairs, &c. After several comparisons of this kind, they recapitulate the late severities of the bishops in their ecclesiastical courts; and conclude with an humble petition to the high court of parliament, "that if episcopacy be retained in the church it may be reduced to its primitive simplicity; and if they must have a liturgy, that there may be a consultation of divines to alter and reform the present; and that even then it may not be imposed upon the clergy, but left to the discretion of the minister, how much of it to read when there is a sermon."

By this representation it appears, that the controversy between these divines might have been compromised, if the rest of the clergy had been of the same spirit and temper with bishop Hall; but the court-bishops would abate nothing as long as the crown could support them; and as the parliament increased in power, the Puritan divines stiffened in their demands, till methods of accommodation were impracticable.

While this controversy was debating at home, letters were sent from both sides to obtain the judgment of foreign divines, but most of them were so wise as to be silent. Dr. Plume, in the life of bishop Hacket, writes that Blondel, Vossius, Hornbeck, and Salmasius, were sent to by the king's friends in vain; Blondel published a very learned treatise on the Puritan side; but Deodate from Geneva, and Amyraldus from France, wished an accommodation, and, as Plume says, were for episcopal government. The Papists triumphed, and had raised expectations from these differences, as appears by a letter of T. White, a Roman Catholic, to the lord-viscount Gage at Dublin, dated February 12, 1639, in which are these words; "We are in a fair way to assuage heresy and her episcopacy; for Exeter's book has done more for the Catholics, than they could have done themselves, he having written, that episcopacy in office and jurisdiction is absolutely *jure divino* (which was the old

quarrel between our bishops and king Henry VIII. during his heresy), which book does not a little trouble our adversaries, who declare this tenet of Exeter's to be contrary to the laws of this land——All is like to prosper here, so I hope with you there."* However, it is certain, the body of foreign Protestants were against the bishops, for this reason among others, because they had disowned their ordinations; and could it be supposed they should compliment away the validity of their administrations, to a set of men that had disowned their communion, and turned the French and Dutch congregations out of the land? No, they wished they might be humbled by the parliament. Lord Clarendon adds, "They were glad of an occasion to publish their resentments against the church, and to enter into the same conspiracy against the crown, without which they could have done little hurt."

But the cause of the hierarchy being to be decided at another tribunal, no applications were wanting on either side to make friends in the parliament-house, and to get hands to petitions. The industry of the several parties on this occasion is almost incredible; and it being the fashion of the time to judge of the sense of the nation this way, messengers were sent all over England to promote the work. Lord Clarendon, and after him Dr. Nalson and others of that party, complain of great disingenuity on the side of the Puritans: his lordship says,† "that the paper which contained the ministers' petition was filled with a very few hands, but that many other sheets were annexed, for the reception of numbers that gave credit to the undertaking; but that when their names were subscribed, the petition itself was cut off, and a new one of a very different nature annexed to the long list of names; and when some of the ministers complained to the reverend Mr. Marshall, with whom the petition was lodged, that they never saw the petition to which their hands were annexed, but had signed another against the canons, Mr. Marshall is said to reply, that it was thought fit by those that understood business better than they, that the latter petition should be rather preferred than the former." This is a charge of a very high nature,‡ and ought to be well supported: if it had

* Foxes and Firebrands, part 2. p. 61. † Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 201.

‡ This charge we have seen brought forward by Dr. Grey, to discredit what Mr.

been true, why did they not complain to the committee which the house of commons appointed to inquire into the irregular methods of procuring hands to petitions? His lordship answers, that they were prevailed with to sit still and pass it by; for which we have only his lordship's word, nothing of this kind being to be found in Rushworth, Whitelocke, or any disinterested writer of those times.

However, it cannot be denied that there was a great deal of art and persuasion used to get hands to petitions on both sides, and many subscribed their names who were not capable to judge of the merits of the cause. The petitions against the hierarchy were of two sorts; some desiring that the whole fabric might be destroyed; of these the chief was the root and branch petition, signed by the hands of about fifteen thousand citizens and inhabitants of London; others aiming only at a reformation of the hierarchy; of these the chief was the ministers' petition, signed with the names of seven hundred beneficed clergyman, and followed by others with an incredible number of hands, from Kent, Gloucestershire, Lancashire, Nottingham, and other counties. The petitions in favour of the present establishment were not less numerous, for within the compass of this and the next year, there were presented to the king and house of lords no less than nineteen, from the two universities, from Wales, Lancashire, Staffordshire, and other counties, subscribed with about one hundred thousand hands, whereof, according to Dr. Walker, six thousand were nobility, gentry, and dignified clergy. One would think by this account, that the whole nation had been with them; but can it be supposed, that the honest freeholders of Lancashire and Wales could be proper judges of such allegations in their petitions as these? —That there can be no church without bishops—that no ordination was ever performed without bishops;—that without bishops there can be no presbyters, and by consequence no consecration of the Lord's supper—that it has never been customary for presbyters to lay hands upon bishops, from whence the disparity of their function is evident—that a bishop has a character that cannot be commu-

Neal had reported, concerning the number of petitions sent up from all parts of the country against the clergy. When, as he proceeded to his review of Mr. Neal's history, he says that our author had himself had before his readers this charge of lord Clarendon's, it would have been candid in him to have cancelled his own strictures on this point, or to have exposed the futility of Mr. Neal's reply to his lordship.—Ed.

nicated but by one of the same distinction—and that the church has been governed by bishops without interruption for fifteen hundred years. These are topics fit to be debated in a synod of learned divines, but the tacking a hundred thousand names of freeholders on either side, could prove no more than that the honest countrymen acted too much by an implicit faith in their clergy. Loud complaints being made to the parliament of unfair methods of procuring names to petitions, the house appointed a committee to examine into the matter; but there being great faults, as I apprehend, on both sides, the affair was dropped.

The root and branch petition was presented to the house December 11, 1640, by alderman Pennington and others, in the name of his majesty's subjects in and about the city of London, and adjacent counties. It was thought to be the contrivance of the Scots commissioners, who were become very popular at this time. The petition sheweth, "that whereas the government of archbishops and lord-bishops, deans and archdeacons, &c. with their courts and ministrations in them, have proved prejudicial, and very dangerous to the church and commonwealth; they themselves having formerly held, that they have their jurisdiction or power of human authority, till of late they have claimed their calling immediately from Christ, which is against the laws of this kingdom, and derogatory to his majesty's state royal. And whereas the said government is found by woful experience, to be a main cause and occasion of many foul evils, pressures, and grievances, of a very high nature, to his majesty's subjects, in their consciences, liberties, and estates, as in a schedule of particulars hereunto annexed, may in part appear:

"We therefore most humbly pray and beseech this honourable assembly, the premises considered, that the said government with all its dependences, roots, and branches, may be abolished, and all the laws in their behalf made void, and that the government, according to God's word, may be rightly placed among us: and we your humble suppleants, as in duty bound, shall ever pray, &c."

The schedule annexed to the petition contained twenty-eight grievances and pressures, the chief of which were, the bishops suspending and depriving ministers for nonconformity to certain rites and ceremonies; their discountenancing

preaching; their claim of *jus divinum;* their administering the oath *ex officio;* the exorbitant power of the high-commission, with the other innovations already mentioned.

The friends of the establishment opposed this petition, with one of their own in favour of the hierarchy, in the following words:

"To the honourable the knights, citizens, &c. the petition of, &c. humbly sheweth,

"That whereas of late, a petition subscribed by many who pretend to be inhabitants of this city, hath been delivered, received, and read, in this honourable house, against the ancient, present, and by law established, government of the church; and that not so much for the reformation of bishops, as for the utter subversion and extirpation of episcopacy itself; we whose names are underwritten, to shew there be many, and those of the better sort of the inhabitants of this city, otherwise and better minded, do humbly represent unto this honourable house, these considerations following:

1. "That episcopacy is as ancient as Christianity itself in this kingdom.

2. "That bishops were the chief instruments in the reformation of the church against Popery, and afterward the most eminent martyrs for the Protestant religion, and since, the best and ablest champions for the defence of it.

3. "That since the Reformation the times have been very peaceable, happy, and glorious, notwithstanding the episcopal government in the church, and therefore that this government can be no cause of our unhappiness.

4. "We conceive that not only many learned, but divers other godly persons, would be much scandalized and troubled in conscience, if the government of episcopacy, conceived by them to be an apostolical institution, were altered; and since there is so much care taken, that no man should be offended in the least ceremony, we hope there will be some, that such men's consciences may not be pressed upon in a matter of a higher nature and consequence, especially considering that this government by episcopacy is not only lawful and convenient for edification, but likewise suitable to, and agreeable with, the civil policy and government of this state.

5. "That this government is lawful, it appears by the

immediate, universal, and constant, practice of all the Christian world, grounded upon Scripture, from the apostles' time to this last age, for above fifteen hundred years together, it being utterly incredible, if not impossible, that the whole church, for so long a time, should not discover, by God's word, this government to be unlawful, if it had been so; to which may be added, that the most learned Protestants, even in those very churches which now are not governed by bishops, do not only hold the government by episcopacy to be lawful, but wish that they themselves might enjoy it.

"Again, That the government by episcopacy is not only lawful, but convenient for edification, and as much or more conducing to piety and devotion than any other, it appears, because no modest man denies that the primitive times were most famous for piety, constancy, and perseverance, in the faith, notwithstanding more frequent and more cruel persecutions than ever have been since, and yet it is confessed that the church in those times was governed by bishops.

"Lastly, That the government of the church by episcopacy is most suitable to the form and frame of the civil government here in this kingdom, it appears by the happy and flourishing union of them both for so long a time together; whereas no man can give us an assurance how any church-government besides this (whereof we have had so long experience) will suit and agree with the civil policy of this state. And we conceive it may be of dangerous consequence for men of settled fortunes, to hazard their estates, by making so great an alteration, and venturing upon a new form of government, whereof neither we nor our ancestors have had any trial or experience, especially considering that those who would have episcopacy to be abolished, have not yet agreed, nor (as we are verily persuaded) ever will or can agree upon any other common form of government to succeed in the room of it; as appears by the many different and contrary draughts and platforms they have made and published, according to the several humours and sects of those that made them; wherein, seeing every great alteration in a church or state must needs be dangerous, it is just and reasonable, that whosoever would introduce a new form instead of an old one, should be obliged to demonstrate and make it evidently appear aforehand, that the government he would introduce is proportionably so much better

than that he would abolish, as may recompense the loss we may sustain, and may be worthy of the hazard we must run in abolishing the one, and introducing and settling of the other; but this we are confident can never be done, in regard of this particular.

"And therefore our humble and earnest request to this honourable house, is, that as well in this consideration, as all the other aforesaid, we may still enjoy that government which most probably holds its institution from the apostles, and most certainly its plantation with our Christian faith itself in this kingdom, where it hath ever since flourished, and continued for many ages without any interruption or alteration; whereby it plainly appears, that as it is the most excellent government in itself, so it is the most suitable, most agreeable, and every way most proportionable, to the civil constitution and temper of this state; and therefore we pray and hope, will always be continued and preserved in it and by it, notwithstanding the abuses and corruptions which in so long a tract of time, through the errors or negligence of men, have crept into it; which abuses and corruptions being all of them (what and how many soever there may be) but merely accidental to episcopacy, we conceive and hope there may be a reformation of the one, without a destruction of the other;

"Which is the humble suit of, &c. &c."

A third petition was presented to the house, January 23, by ten or twelve clergymen, in the name of seven hundred of their brethren who had signed it, called the ministers' petition, praying for a reformation of certain grievances in the hierarchy, but not an entire subversion of it; a schedule of these grievances was annexed, which being referred to the committee, Mr. Crew reported the three following, as proper for the debate of the house: "1. The secular employments of the clergy. 2. The sole power of the bishops in ecclesiastical affairs, and particularly in ordinations and church-censures. 3. The large revenues of deans and chapters, with the inconveniences that attend the application of them."

Two days after the delivery of this petition [January 25] his majesty came to the house, and very unadvisedly interrupted their debates by the following speech: "—There are some men that more maliciously than ignorantly will put

no difference between reformation and alteration of government: hence it comes to pass, that divine service is irreverently interrupted, and petitions in an ill way given in, neither disputed nor denied, against the present established government, in the names of divers counties, with threatenings against the bishops, that they will make them but ciphers. Now I must tell you, that I make a great difference between reformation and alteration of government; though I am for the first, I cannot give way to the latter. If some of them have overstretched their power, and encroached too much on their temporality, I shall not be unwilling that these things should be redressed and reformed; nay farther, if you can shew me, that the bishops have some temporal authority inconvenient for the state, and not necessary for the government of the church and upholding episcopal jurisdiction, I shall not be unwilling to desire them to lay it down; but this must not be understood that I shall any ways consent that their voices in parliament should be taken away, for in all the times of my predecessors, since the Conquest and before, they have enjoyed it as one of the fundamental constitutions of the kingdom." This unhappy method of the king's coming to the house, and declaring his resolutions beforehand, was certainly unparliamentary, and did the church no service; nor was there any occasion for it at this time, the house being in no disposition as yet, to order a bill to be brought in for subverting the hierarchy.

In the months of February and March, several days were appointed for the consideration of these petitions; and when the bill for the utter extirpating the episcopal order was brought into the house in the months of May and June, several warm speeches were made on both sides; I will set the chief of them before the reader at one view, though they were spoken at different times.

Among those who were for root and branch, or the total extirpating of episcopacy, was sir Henry Vane, who stood up and argued, that "since the house had voted epi copal government a great impediment to the reformation and growth of religion, it ought to be taken away, for it is so corrupt in the foundation (says he) that if we pull it not down, it will fall about the ears of those that endeavour it within a few years. This government was brought in by

antichrist, and has let in all kinds of superstition in the church—It has been the instrument of displacing the most godly and conscientious ministers, of vexing, punishing, and banishing out of the kingdom, the most religious of all sorts and conditions, that would not comply with their superstitious inventions and ceremonies. In a word, it has turned the edge of the government against the very life and power of godliness, and the favour and protection of it towards all profane, scandalous, and superstitious persons that would uphold their party—It has divided us from the foreign Protestant churches, and has done what it could to bind the nation in perpetual slavery to themselves and their superstitious inventions, by the late canons.—Farther, this government has been no less prejudicial to the civil liberties of our country, as appears by the bishops preaching up the doctrine of arbitrary power, by their encouraging the late illegal projects to raise money without parliament, by their kindling a war between England and Scotland, and falling in with the plots and combinations that have been entered into against this present parliament." Sir Harry concludes from these premises, "that the Protestant religion must always be in danger, as long as it is in the hands of such governors; nor can there be any hopes of reformation in the state, while the bishops have votes in parliament; that the fruit being so bad the tree must be bad. Let us not then halt between two opinions (says he), but with one heart and voice give glory to God, by complying with his providence, and with the safety and peace of the church and state, which is by passing the root and branch bill."*

Mr. serjeant Thomas gave the house a long historical narration of the viciousness and misbehaviour of the bishops in the times of Popery; of their treasonable and rebellious conduct towards their sovereigns; of their antipathy to the laws and liberties of their country; of their ignorance, pride, and addictedness to the pomp of this world, to the apparent neglect of their spiritual functions; and of their enmity to all methods of reformation to this day.†

Mr. Bagshaw stood up to reply to the objections made against abolishing the order of bishops.

"It is asserted (says he) that it is of divine right, which is contrary to the statute 37 of Henry VIII. cap. 17, which

* Nalson's Collections, vol. 2. p. 270.

† Ibid. vol. 2. p. 211.

says, they have their episcopal authority and all other ecclesiastical jurisdiction whatsoever, solely and only, by, from, and under, the king.

"It is argued, that episcopacy is inseparable from the crown, and therefore it is commonly said, No bishop no king; which is very ridiculous, because the kings of England were long before bishops, and may still depose them.

"It is said, that episcopacy is a third state in parliament; but this I deny, for the three states are the king, the lords temporal, and the commons. Kings of England have held several parliaments without bishops; king Edward I. in the 24th of his reign, held a parliament *ex laso clero*; and in the parliament of the 7th Richard II. there is mention made of the consent of the lords temporal and the commons, but not a word of the clergy; since therefore the present hierarchy was of mere human institution, and had been found a very great grievance to the subject, he inclined to the root and branch petition."

Mr. White entered more fully into the merits of the cause, and considered the present bishops of the church with regard to their baronies, their temporalities, and their spiritualities.

"The former (says he) are merely of the king's favour, and began in this kingdom the 4th of William the Conqueror, by virtue whereof they have had place in the house of peers in parliament; but in the 7th Henry VIII. (1816, Kel.) it was resolved by all the judges of England, that the king may hold his parliament by himself, his temporal lords, and commons, without any bishop; for a bishop has not any place in parliament by reason of his spiritualities, but merely by reason of his barony, and accordingly acts of parliament have been made without them, as 2 Richard II. cap. 3, and at other times; nor were they ever called spiritual lords in our statutes, till 16 Richard II. cap. 1.

"By the bishop's spiritualities I mean, those spiritual powers which raise him above the order of a presbyter; and here I consider, first, his authority over presbyters by the oath of canonical obedience, by which he may command them to collect tenths granted in convocation, according to 20 Henry VI. cap. 13. Secondly, his office, which is partly judicial and partly ministerial; by the former, he judges in his courts of all matters ecclesiastical and spiritual within

his diocess, and of the fitness of such as are presented to him to be instituted into benefices; by the latter he is to sacred places dedicated to divine service. 9 Henry VI. cap. 17, he is to provide for the officiating of cures in the avoidance of churches, on neglect of the patron's presenting thereunto. He is to certify loyal [or lawful] matrimony, general bastardy, and excommunication. He is to execute judgments given in *quare impedit*, upon the writ *ad admittendum clericum*. He is to attend upon trials for life, to report the sufficiency or insufficiency of such as demand clergy; and lastly, he is to ordain deacons and presbyters.

"Now all these being given to these bishops *jure humano*, says Mr. White, I conceive, may for just reasons be taken away. He affirms, that, according to Scriptuae, a bishop and presbyter is one and the same person; for (1.) Their duties are mentioned as the same, the bishop being to teach and rule his church, 1 Tim. iii. 2. 5, and the presbyter being to do the very same, 1 Pet. v. 2, 3. (2.) Presbyters in Scripture are said to be bishops of the Holy Ghost, Acts xx. 28. And St. Paul charges the presbyters of Ephesus, to take heed to the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them bishops or overseers; and other bishops the Holy Ghost never made. (3.) Among the enumeration of church-officers Eph. iv. 11, whereof the three former are extraordinary, and are ceased, there remains only the pastor and teacher, which is the very same with the presbyter. The bishop, as he is more than this, is no officer given by God; and it is an encroachment upon the kingly office of Christ, to admit other officers into the church than he himself has appointed.

"Seeing then episcopacy may be taken away in all, wherein it exceeds the presbyter's office, which is certainly *jure divino*, we ought to restore the presbyters to their rights which the bishops have taken from them, as particularly to the right of ordination, excommunication, and liberty to preach the whole counsel of God without restraint from a bishop; they should have their share in the discipline and government of the church; and in a word, all superiority of order between bishops and presbyters should be taken away." Mr. White is farther of opinion, that the bishops should be deprived of their baronies, and all intermeddling with civil affairs; that institution and induction,

the jurisdiction of tithes, causes matrimonial and testamentary, and other usurpations of the ecclesiastical courts, should be restored to the civil judicature, and be determined by the laws of the land.

In order to take off the force of these arguments, in favour of the root and branch petition, the friends of the hierarchy said, that the very best things might be corrupted; that to take away the order of bishops was to change the whole constitution for they knew not what; they therefore urged the ministers' petition for reformation, and declaimed with vehemence against the corruptions of the late times.

Lord Falkland, who in the judgment of the noble historian was the most extraordinary person of his age, stood up and said;

"Mr. Speaker,

"He is a great stranger in our Israel, who knows not that this kingdom has long laboured under many and great oppressions, both in religion and liberty; and that a principal cause of both has been, some bishops and their adherents, who, under pretence of uniformity, have brought in superstition and scandal under the title of decency; who have defiled our churches by adorning them, and slackened the strictness of that union that was between us and those of our religion beyond sea; an action both unpolitic and ungodly.*

"They have been less eager on those who damn our church, than on those who, on weak conscience and perhaps as weak reason, only abstain from it. Nay, it has been more dangerous for men to go to a neighbouring parish when they had no sermon in their own, than to be obstinate and perpetual recusants. While mass has been said in security, a conventicle has been a crime; and which is yet more, the conforming to ceremonies has been more exacted than the conforming to Christianity; and while men for scruples have been undone, for attempts of sodomy they have only been admonished.

"Mr. Speaker, they have resembled the dog in the fable, they have neither practised themselves, nor employed those that should, nor suffered those that would. They have brought in catechising only to thrust out preaching; cried down lectures by the name of faction, either because other

* Rushworth vol. 1 p. 181, or part 2 vol. 1.

men's industry in that duty appeared a reproof to their neglect, or with intent to have brought in darkness, that they might the easier sow their tares while it was night.

"In this they have abused his majesty as well as his people, for when he had with great wisdom silenced on both parts those opinions, that will always trouble the schools, they made use of this declaration to tie up one side and let the other loose. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, as some ministers in our state first took away our money, and afterward endeavoured to make our money not worth taking, by depraving it; so these men first depressed the power of preaching, and then laboured to make it such, as the harm had not been much if it had been depressed; the chief subjects of the sermons being, the *jus divinum* of bishops and tithes; the sacredness of the clergy; the sacrilege of impropriations; the demolishing of Puritanism; the building up of the prerogative, &c. In short, their work has been to try how much of the Papist might be brought in without Popery, and to destroy as much as they could of the gospel, without bringing themselves in danger of being destroyed by the law.

"Mr. Speaker, these men have been betrayers of our rights and liberties, by encouraging such men as Dr. Beal and Manwaring; by appearing for monopolies and ship-money; some of them have laboured to exclude all persons and causes of the clergy from the temporal magistrate, and by hindering prohibitions, to have taken away the only legal bounds to their arbitrary power; they have encouraged all the clergy to suits, and have brought all suits to the council-table, that having all power in ecclesiastical matters, they might have an equal power in temporals; they have both kindled and blown the common fire of both nations, and have been the first and principal cause of the breach since the pacification at Berwick.

"Mr. Speaker, I have represented no small quantity, and no mean degree, of guilt, but this charge does not lie against episcopacy, but against the persons who have abused that sacred function; for if we consider, that the first spreaders of Christianity, the first defenders of it, both with their ink and blood, as well as our late reformers, were all bishops; and even now, in this great defection of the order, there are one that have been neither proud nor ambitious; some that

have been learned opposers of Popery, and zealous suppressers of Arminianism, between whom and their inferior clergy there has been no distinction in frequent preaching; whose lives are untouched, not only by guilt, but by malice; I say, if we consider this, we shall conclude, that bishops may be good men, and let us but give good men good rules, and we shall have good government and good times.

"I am content to take away from them all those things which may, in any degree of possibility, occasion the like mischiefs with those I have mentioned: I am sure neither their lordships, judging of tithes, wills, and marriages, no, nor their voices in parliament, are *jure divino*. If their revenues are too great, let us leave them only such proportion as may serve, in some good degree, for the support of the dignity of learning and encouragement of students. If it be found they will employ their laws against their weaker brethren, let us take away those laws, and let no ceremonies which any number count unlawful, and no man counts necessary, be imposed upon them; but let us not abolish, upon a few days' debate, an order that has lasted in most churches these sixteen hundred years. I do not believe the order of bishops to be *jure divino*, nor do I think them unlawful; but since all great changes in government are dangerous, I am for trying if we cannot take away the inconveniences of bishops, and the inconveniences of no bishops. Let us therefore go upon the debate of grievances, and if the grievances may be taken away and the order stand, we shall not need to commit the London petition at all; but if it shall appear that the abolition of the one cannot be but by the destruction of the other, then let us not commit the London petition, but grant it."

Lord George Digby, an eminent royalist, spoke with great warmth against the root and branch petition, and with no less zeal for a reformation of grievances.

"If the London petition (says his lordship) may be considered only as an index of grievances I should wink at the faults of it, for no man within these walls is more sensible of the heavy grievances of church-government than myself; nor whose affections are keener for the clipping those wings of the prelates, whereby they have mounted to such insolence; but having reason to believe that some aim at the

total extirpation of bishops, I cannot restrain myself from labouring to divert it.

"I look upon the petition with terror, as on a comet or a blazing star, raised and kindled out of the poisonous exhalations of a corrupted hierarchy: methought the comet had a terrible tail, and pointed to the north; and I fear all the prudence of this house will have a hard work to hinder this meteor from causing such distempers and combustions as it portends by its appearance; whatever the event be, I shall discharge my conscience freely, unbiassed both from popularity and court-respect."*

His lordship then goes on to argue the unreasonableness of abolishing a thing, because of some abuses that attend it; he complains of the presumption of the petitioners, in desiring the repeal of so many laws at once, and not applying in a more modest manner for a redress of grievances, as the ministers have done. On the other hand, he allows the behaviour of the prelates had given too just an occasion for it; that no people had been so insulted as the people of England had lately been, by the insolences of the prelates; "their vengeance has been so laid, as if it were meant no generation, no degree, no complexion of mankind, should escape it. Was there a man of tender conscience (says his lordship), him they loaded with unnecessary impositions; was there a man of legal conscience, him they nettled with innovations, and fresh introductions to Popery; was there a man of an humble spirit, him they trampled to dirt in their pride; was there a man of proud spirit, him they have bereft of reason, with indignation at their superlative insolence; was there a man faithfully attached to the rights of the crown, how has he been galled by their new oath! was there a man that durst mutter against their insolences, he may inquire for his lugs. They have been within the bishops' visitation as if they would not only derive their brandishment of the spiritual sword from St. Peter, but of the material one too, and the right to cut off ears; for my part I am so inflamed with these things, that I am ready to cry, with the loudest of the fifteen thousand, Down with them to the ground.

"But Mr. Speaker, we must divest ourselves of passion; we all agree a reformation of church-government is neces-

* Rushworth, p. 172.

sary; but before I can strike at the root, and agree to a total extirpation of episcopacy, it must be made manifest to me, (1.) That the mischiefs we have felt arise from the nature of episcopacy, and not from its abuse. (2.) Such a form of government must be set before us as is not liable to proportionable inconveniences. (3.) It must appear that the Utopia is practicable. Let us therefore lay aside the thoughts of extirpating bishops, and reduce them to their primitive standard; let us retrench their dioceses; let them govern by assemblies of their clergy; let us exclude them from intermeddling in secular affairs, and appoint a standing committee to collect all the grievances of the church, and no man's votes shall be given with more zeal for redressing them than mine."

Surely the bishops must have behaved very ill in the late times, that their very best friends could load them with such reproaches! Sir Benjamin Rudyard, surveyor of the court of wards, sir Harbottle Grimstone, with a great many others of unquestionable duty and loyalty to the king, spoke the same language, and it deserves to be remembered, says lord Clarendon,* that in the midst of these complaints the king was never mentioned but with great honour; all the grievances being laid at the door of his ministers, and all hopes of redress being placed in his majesty alone. At the close of the debate, it was ordered that the root and branch petition should remain in the hands of the clerk of the house of commons, with direction that no copy should be delivered out; but after the throwing out of the bill to deprive the bishops of their votes in parliament, it was revived, and a bill brought in by sir Edward Deering [May 20, 1641] for the utter extirpating of the whole order, as will be seen hereafter.

It was in this debate that some smart repartees passed between the members; Mr. Grimstone argued thus, that bishops are *jure divino* is a question; that archbishops are not *jure divino* is out of question; now that bishops which are questioned whether *jure divino*, or archbishops which out of question are not *jure divino*, should suspend ministers which are *jure divino*, I leave to you to be considered. To which Mr. Selden answered, that the convocation is *jure divino* is a question; that parliaments are not *jure divino* is

* Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 61.

out of the question; that religion is *jure divino* is no question; now that the convocation which is questionable whether *jure divino*, and parliaments which out of the question are not *jure divino*, should meddle with religion which questionless is *jure divino*, I leave to your consideration. In both which I apprehend there is more of a jingle of words than strength of argument.*

But the house was unanimous for a reformation of the hierarchy, which was all that the body of Puritans as yet wished for or desired. The ministers' petition was therefore committed to a committee of the whole house, and on March 9, they came to this resolution, "that the legislative and judicial power of bishops in the house of peers, is a great hinderance to the discharge of their spiritual function, prejudicial to the commonwealth, and fit to be taken away by bill; and that a bill be drawn up to this purpose." March 11, it was resolved further, "that for bishops or any other clergyman to be in the commission of peace, or to have any judicial power in the star-chamber or in any civil court, is a great hinderance to their spiritual function, and fit to be taken away by bill." And not many days after it was resolved, that they should not be privy-counsellors or in any temporal offices.

While the house of commons were thus preparing to clip the wings of the bishops, they were not unmindful of the Roman Catholics; these were criminals of a higher nature, and had a deep share in the present calamities; their numbers were growing, and their pride and insolence insufferable: they flocked in great numbers about the court, and insulted the very courts of judicature; the queen protected them, and the king and archbishop countenanced them as friends of the prerogative. Andreas ab Harbensfield, the queen of Bohemia's chaplain, advised his grace of a Popish confederacy against the king and the church of England; but when the names of Montague, sir Kenelm Digby, Winter, Windebank, and Porter, all Papists, and officers about the court, were mentioned as parties, the whole was discredited and stifled. When the house of commons petitioned the king to issue out a proclamation for putting the laws in execution against Papists, it was done in so defective a man-

* Selden's argument is considered by bishop Warburton, as a thorough confutation of Grimstone's.—Ed.

ner, that the committee reported it would avail nothing; for in the clause which enjoins all Popish recusants to depart the city within fifteen days, it is added, "without special licence had thereunto;" so that if they could obtain a licence from his majesty, or from the lords of the council, the bishop, the lieutenant, or deputy-lieutenant, of the county, then they were not within the penalty. Besides, the disarming of all Popish recusants was limited to recusants convicted; so that if they were not convicted, a justice of peace could not disarm them. They observed farther, that many recusants had letters of grace to protect their persons and estates; that instead of departing from London there was a greater resort of Papists at present than heretofore; and that their insolence and threatening language were insufferable and dangerous. A gentleman having given information in open court to one of the judges of the King's-bench, that in one parish in the city of Westminster there were above six thousand recusants, the committee appointed Mr. Heywood, an active justice of peace, to collect and bring in a list of the names of all recusants within that city and liberties; for which purpose all the inhabitants were summoned to appear and take the oaths in Westminster-hall: but while the justice was in the execution of his office, and pressing one James a Papist to take them, the wretch drew out his knife and stabbed the justice in the open court, telling him, "he gave him that for persecuting poor Catholics." The old gentleman sunk down with the wound, but by the care of surgeons was recovered, and the criminal taken into custody.* This Mr. Heywood was the very person who, being commanded by king James I. to search the cellars under the parliament-house at the time of the gunpowder-plot, took Guy Faux with his dark lantern in his hand, which lantern is preserved among the archives of Oxford, with Mr. Heywood's name upon it in letters of gold.

The parliament, alarmed at this daring attempt, sent or-

* Dr. Grey is displeased with Mr. Neal for not informing his reader, how the king acted on this occasion; especially as he says, according to the first edition, "the king favours them," i. e. the Papists. This is the marginal contents of the following paragraph, and the fact is there fully established. With respect to the attempt made on the life of Mr. Heywood, his majesty, it should be acknowledged, expressed a proper abhorrence of it, and "recommended it to parliament, to take course for a speedy and exemplary punishment" of it. For which the house returned their humble thanks. But this instance of royal justice is not sufficient to wipe off the charge of general and great partiality towards the Catholics. Rushworth's Collections, part 3. vol. 1. p. 57.—Ed.

ders to all the justices of peace of Westminster, London, and Middlesex, requiring them to command the churchwardens to make a return of the names of all recusants within their parishes, in order to their being proceeded against according to law; a few days after the like orders were sent to the justices in the remoter counties. The houses petitioned his majesty to discharge all Popish officers in garrisons or in the army, who refused to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and to fill up their places with Protestants. March 16, they petitioned his majesty to remove all Papists from court, and particularly sir Kenelm Digby, sir Toby Matthews, sir John Winter, and Mr. Montague, and that the whole body of Roman Catholics might be disarmed. The answer returned was, that his majesty would take care that the Papists about the court should give no just cause of scandal; and as for disarming them, he was content it should be done according to law. So that their addresses had no other effect than to exasperate the Papists, the king and queen being determined to protect them as long as they were able.

There was at this time one Goodman a seminary priest under condemnation in Newgate, whom the king, instead of leaving to the sentence of the law, reprieved in the face of his parliament; whereupon both houses [January 29, 1610] agreed upon the following remonstrance:

"That considering the present juncture, they conceived the strict execution of the laws against recusants more necessary than formerly,

1. "Because by divers petitions from several parts of the kingdom, complaints are made of the great increase of Popery and superstition; priests and Jesuits swarm in great abundance in this kingdom, and appear as boldly as if there were no laws against them.

2. "It appears to the house, that of late years many priests and Jesuits condemned for high treason have been discharged out of prison.

3. "That at this time the pope has a nuncio or agent in this city; and Papists go as publicly to mass at Denmark-house, and at St. James's and the ambassadors' chapels, as others do to their parish churches.

4. "That the putting the laws in execution against Papists, is for the preservation and advancement of the true

religion established in this kingdom; for the safety of their majesties' persons, and the security of government.

5. "It is found that Goodman the priest has been twice formerly committed and discharged; that his residence now in London was in absolute contempt of his majesty's proclamation; that he was formerly a minister of the church of England; and therefore they humbly desire he may be left to the justice of the law."

To this remonstrance the king replied,

"That the increase of Popery and superstition, if any such thing had happened, was contrary to his inclination; but to take off all occasions of complaint he would order the laws to be put in execution.

"That he would set forth a proclamation to command Jesuits and priests to depart the kingdom within a month; and in case they either failed or returned, they should be proceeded against according to law.

"As touching the pope's nuncio Rosetti, his commission reached only to keep up a correspondence between the queen and the pope, in things relative to the exercise of religion; that this correspondence came within the compass of the full liberty of conscience secured her by the articles of marriage; however, since Rosetti's character happened to be misunderstood and gave offence, he had persuaded the queen to consent to his being recalled.

"Farther, his majesty promised to take care to restrain his subjects from going to mass at Denmark-house, St. James's, and the chapels of the ambassadors.

"Lastly, touching Goodman, he was content to remit him to the pleasure of the house; but he puts them in mind that neither queen Elizabeth nor king James ever put any to death merely for religion; and desired them to consider the inconveniences that such a conduct might draw upon his subjects and other Protestants in foreign countries."

How strange this assertion! Let the reader recollect the many executions of Papists for denying the supremacy; the burning the Dutch Anabaptists, for whom Mr. Fox the martyrologist interceded in vain; and the hanging of Barrow, Greenwood, Penry, &c. in the reign of queen Elizabeth; let him also remember the burning of Bartholomew Legate and Edward Wightman, for the Arian heresy by king James I. (of all which, and some others, the commons in their reply

put his majesty in mind); and then judge of the truth of this part of his declaration. Nor did the Jesuits regard the other parts of it, for they knew they had a friend in the king's bosom that would protect them, and therefore, instead of removing out of the land, they lay concealed within the verge of the court. Even Goodman himself was not executed,* though the king promised to leave him to the law, and though he himself petitioned, like Jonah the prophet, to be thrown overboard to allay the tempest between the king and his subjects. Such was his majesty's attachment to this people! to the apparent hazard of the Protestant religion and the peace of his kingdoms, and to the sacrificing all good correspondence between himself and his parliament.

CHAP. IX.

FROM THE IMPEACHMENT OF THE EARL OF STRAFFORD, TO THE RECESS OF THE PARLIAMENT UPON THE KING'S PROGRESS IN SCOTLAND.

It is impossible to account for the prodigious changes of this and the years immediately succeeding, without taking a short view of some civil occurrences that paved the way for them: In pursuance of the design of bringing corrupt ministers to justice, the parliament began with Thomas Wentworth earl of Strafford, an able statesman, but a most

* Whitelocke informs us, that the king left him to the parliament: "and they (says bishop Warburton) would not order his execution. The truth of the matter was this; each party was desirous of throwing the odium of Goodman's execution on the other; so between both the man escaped." On this ground, his lordship exclaims, "How prejudiced is the representation of our historian!" In reply to this reflection, it may be asked, Did it not shew the king's partiality and reluctance to have the law executed against Goodman, that he remitted the matter to the house? Did not the inflicting the sentence of the law lie solely with himself, as invested with the executive power? and yet he did not inflict it. Doth not this conduct justify Mr. Neal's representation? nay, that representation is just and candid if it pointed to the reprieve only, which produced the remonstrance of the parliament. There would not have been any occasion for that remonstrance, had it not been for his majesty's attachment to men of that description.

The advocates of the king have considered his conduct towards Goodman as an amiable act of humanity; nay, as proceeding from a mind most sensibly touched with the "gallantry," as it is called, of this man in petitioning to be made a sacrifice to the justice of the law, to serve his majesty's interest and affairs. Dr. Grey, and Nalson's Collections, vol. 1. p. 716.—Ed.

dangerous enemy of the laws and liberties of his country, whom they impeached of high treason November 11, 1640, and brought to his trial the 22d of March following. The grand article of his impeachment* was, "for endeavouring to subvert the fundamental laws of England and Ireland, and to introduce an arbitrary and tyrannical government." This was subdivided into several branches, supported by a multiplicity of facts, none of which were directly treason by law, but being put together were construed to be such by accumulation. The earl's reply to the facts consisted partly in excuses and evasions; with an humble acknowledgment that in some things he had been mistaken; but his principal defence rested upon a point of law, "Whether an endeavour to subvert the fundamental form of government, and the laws of the land, was high treason at common law, or by any statute in force?" Mr. Lane the counsel for the prisoner maintained, (1.) That all treasons were to be reduced to the particulars specified in the 25th Edw. III. cap. 2. (3.) That nothing else was or could be treason; and that it was so enacted by the 1st Henry IV. cap. 10. (3.) That there had been no precedent to the contrary since that time. And (4.) That by 1 Mary, cap. 12, an endeavour to subvert the fundamental laws of the land is declared to be no more than felony.

The commons felt the weight of these arguments; and not being willing to enter into debate with a private barrister, changed their impeachment into a bill of attaindor, which they had a right to do by virtue of a clause in the 25th Edw. III. cap. 2,† which refers the decision of what is treason in all doubtful cases to the king and parliament.‡

* When the earl of Strafford was impeached, the king came into the house of lords, and desired that the articles against him might be read; which the lord-keeper ordered to be done, while many lords cried out, Privilege! privilege! When the king was departed, the house ordered that no entry should be made of the king's demand of hearing the articles read, or of the keeper's compliance with it. A MS. memorandum of Dr. Birch in the British Museum, and quoted in Curiosities of Literature, vol. 2. p. 186.—Ed.

† The words of the statute are,

"And because that many other like cases of treason may happen in time to come which a man cannot think or declare at this present time, it is accorded that if any other case, supposed treason, which is not above specified, doth happen before any justice, the justices shall tarry without any going to judgment of the treason till the cause be showed and declared before the king and his parliament, whether it ought to be judged treason or felony."

‡ The bill of attaindor against the earl of Strafford being formed on this principle and authority, there was a great propriety in the following clause of it: viz. "That no judge or judges, justice or justices whatsoever, shall adjudge or interpret any act or thing to be treason, nor hear or determine treason, in any other manner than he or they

The attainder passed the commons April 19, yeas two hundred and four, noes fifty-nine; but it is thought would have been lost in the house of lords had it not been for the following accident, which put it out of the power of the earl's friends to save him.

The king, being weary of his parliament and desirous to protect his servant, consented to a project of some persons in the greatest trust about the court, to bring the army that was raised against the Scots up to London, in order to awe the two houses, to rescue the earl, and to take possession of the city of London. Lord Clarendon says,* the last motion was rejected with abhorrence, and that the gentleman who made it was the person that discovered the whole plot. The conspirators met in the queen's lodgings at Whitehall, where a petition was drawn up for the officers of the army to sign, and to present to his majesty; with a tender of their readiness to wait upon him in defence of his prerogative against the turbulent spirits of the house of commons; the draught was shewn to the king, and signed in testimony of his majesty's approbation C. R. but the plot being discovered to the earl of Bedford, to the lords Say and Kimbolton, and to Mr. Pym, with the names of the conspirators; all of them absconded, and some fled immediately into France.

Mr. Pym opened the conspiracy to the house of commons May 2, 1641,† and acquainted them, that among other branches of the plot, one was to seize the Tower, to put the earl of Strafford at the head of the Irish army of Papists who were to be transported into England, and to secure the important town of Portsmouth, in order to receive succours from France; sir William Balfour, lieutenant of the Tower, confessed that the king had sent him express orders to receive a hundred men into that garrison under the command of captain Billingsly, to favour the earl's escape; and that the earl himself offered him 20,000*l.* in money, and to ad-

---

should or ought to have done before the passing of this act." This clause has been considered as a reflection on the bill itself, and as an acknowledgment, that the case was too hard and the proceedings too irregular to be drawn into a precedent. But this is a misconstruction of the clause, which did not intimate any consciousness of wrong in those who passed it; but was meant to preserve to parliament the right, in future, which is exercised in this instance, of determining what is treason in all doubtful cases; and was intended to restrain the operation of the bill to this single case. It shewed, observes Mrs. Macaulay, a very laudable attention to the preservation of public liberty. Macaulay's History, vol. 2. 8vo. p. 411, note (t.) and Dr. Harris's Life of Charles I. p. 285, 286.—Ed.

* Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 218. † Rapin, vol. 2. p. 369, folio.

vance his son in marriage to one of the best fortunes in the kingdom. Lord Clarendon has used all his rhetoric to colour over this conspiracy, and to make posterity believe it was little more than the idle chat of some officers at a tavern; but they who will compare the depositions in Rushworth, with his lordship's account of that matter, says bishop Burnet, will find, that there is a great deal more in the one, than the other is willing to believe.* Mr. Echard confesses that the plot was not wholly without a foundation. The court would have disowned it, but their keeping the conspirators in their places, made the parliament believe that there was a great deal more in it than was yet discovered; they therefore sent orders immediately to secure the town and haven of Portsmouth, and to disband the Irish army; they voted that all Papists should be removed from about the court; and directed letters to sir Jacob Ashley, to induce the army to a dutiful behaviour, and to assure them of their full pay.

The consequences of this plot were infinitely prejudicial to the king's affairs; the court lost its reputation; the reverence due to the king and queen was lessened; and the house of commons began to be esteemed the only barrier of the people's liberties; for which purpose they entered into a solemn protestation to stand by each other with their lives and fortunes; the Scots army was continued for their security; a bill for the continuance of the present parliament was brought in and urged with great advantage; and last of all, by the discovery of this plot, the fate of the earl of Strafford was determined; great numbers of people crowded in a tumultuous manner to Westminster, crying, Justice! justice! and threatening violence to those members of the house of commons who had voted against his attainder. In this situation of affairs, and in the absence of the bench of bishops (as being a case of blood), the bill passed with the dissent only of eleven peers. The king had some scruples about giving it the royal assent, because, though he was convinced the earl had been guilty of "high crimes and misdemeanours," he did not apprehend that an "endeavour to subvert the fundamental form of government, and to introduce an arbitrary power, was high treason;" his majesty consulted his bishops and judges, but was not satisfied till

* May's Hist. p. 97—99. Rushworth, part 3, vol. 1. p. 291.

he received a letter from the earl himself, beseeching his majesty to sign the bill, in order to make way for a happy agreement between him and his subjects. Mr. Whitelocke insinuates,* that this letter was but a feint of the earl's; for when secretary Carlton acquainted him with what the king had done, and with the motive, which was his own consent, he rose up in a great surprise, and lifting up his eyes to heaven, said, "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the sons of men, for in them there is no salvation." Two days after this [May 12], he was executed upon Tower-hill, and submitted to the axe with a Roman bravery and courage; but at the restoration of king Charles II. his attainder was reversed, and the articles of accumulative treason declared null, because what is not treason in the several parts cannot amount to treason in the whole.†

This was the unhappy fate of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, once an eminent patriot and assertor of the liberties of his country, but after he was called to court, one of the most arbitrary ministers that this nation ever produced. He was certainly a gentleman of distinguished abilities, as appears by the incomparable defence he made on his trial, which gained him more reputation and esteem with the people, than all the latter actions of his life put together; but still he was a public enemy of his country, and had as great a share in those fatal counsels that brought on the civil war as any man then living. "The earl (says Mr. Echard) was of a severe countenance, insufferably proud and haughty, having a sovereign contempt of the people, whom he never studied to gratify in any thing; the ancient nobility looked upon his sudden rise, and universal influence in public affairs, with envy; so that he had but few friends, and a great many enemies."

Lord Digby, in his famous speech against the bill of attainder, wherein he washes his hands of the blood of the earl of Strafford, has nevertheless these expressions; "I confidently believe him the most dangerous minister, and the most insupportable to free subjects, that can be characterod. I believe his practices in themselves have been as high and tyrannical as any subject ever ventured upon; and the malignity of them is greatly aggravated by those abilities of his, whereof God has given him the use, but the devil the

* Memorials, p. 44. † Nalson's Collections, vol. 2. p. 203.

application. In a word, I believe him still that grand apostate to the commonwealth, who must not expect to be pardoned in this world, till he be dispatched to the other."

Lord Falkland says, "that he committed so many mighty and so manifest enormities and oppressions in the kingdom of Ireland, that the like have not been committed by any governor in any government since Verres left Sicily; and after his lordship was called over from being deputy of Ireland, to be in a manner deputy of England, he and the junctillo gave such counsels and pursued such courses as it is hard to say, whether they were more unwise, more unjust, or more unfortunate."

Lord Clarendon says,* "that he had been compelled, for reasons of state, to exercise many acts of power, and had indulged some to his own appetite and passion, as in the case of the lord-chancellor of Ireland, and the lord Mount Norris, the former of which was *satis pro imperio*, but the latter, the most extravagant piece of sovereignty that in a time of peace had been executed by any subject." From whence the reader may conclude, that whatever encomiums the earl might deserve as a gentleman and a soldier, yet as a statesman he deserved the fate he underwent.

The execution of this great personage struck terror into all the king's late ministers; some of them resigned their places, and others retired into France; among the latter was the lord-keeper Finch and secretary Windebank. Six of the judges were impeached of high crimes and misdemeanours, for "interpreting away the laws of their country;" but the parliament had too much business upon their hands to attend their prosecution at present. Thus this unhappy prince was deprived of those counsellors who were in his own arbitrary sentiments, and left as in a manner to himself, and the powerful influence of his bigoted queen and her cabal of Papists; for the new ministers who succeeded, were such in whom the king would place no confidence. So that most men expected that these vigorous proceedings would induce him to put a speedy end to the session.

But that which prevented it, was the want of money to pay off the armies in the north; his majesty pressed the houses to dispatch this affair, and relieve the country from the burden of contribution; on the other hand, the com-

* Vol. I. p. 150.

mons looked upon the Scots as their security, and that if they were sent home, they should again be at the mercy of the prerogative, supported by a standing army. However, they had begun to borrow money of the city of London towards the expense; but when the plot to dissolve the parliament broke out, the citizens declared they would lend nothing upon parliamentary security, because their sitting was so very precarious. This gave rise to a motion for the continuance of the present parliament, till they should dissolve themselves, which was presently turned into a short bill, and passed both houses with very little opposition, as the only expedient that could be thought of to support the public credit: it enacts, "that this present parliament shall not be adjourned, prorogued, or dissolved, without their own consent:" and was signed by commission with the bill of attainder against the earl of Strafford.

All men stood amazed at the king's weakness on this occasion; for by this hasty and unadvised measure he concurred in a change of the whole constitution, giving the two houses a co-ordinate power in the legislature with himself, for as long time as they pleased: if his majesty had fixed their continuance to a limited time, it might have satisfied the people, and saved the prerogative; but by making them perpetual, he parted with the sceptre out of his own hands, and put it into the hands of his parliament. "This (says Mr. Echard) has made some writers doubt, whether those who afterward took up arms against the king could be legally termed rebels. For by passing this act his majesty made the two houses so far independent upon himself, that they immediately acquired an uncommon authority, and a sort of natural right to inspect and censure his actions, and to provide for the safety of the kingdom."

While the commons were alarmed with the discovery of the plot, and the flight of the conspirators, Mr. Pym moved that both houses might join in some band of defence for the security of their liberties, and of the Protestant religion; accordingly the following protestation was drawn up, and subscribed the very next day by the whole house [May 3].

"I A. B. do in the presence of Almighty God vow and protest, to maintain and defend, as far as lawfully I may, with my life, power, and estate, the true reformed Protestant religion, expressed in the doctrine of the church of

England, against all Popery and Popish innovations in this realm, contrary to the said doctrine; and according to the duty of my allegiance, I will maintain and defend his majesty's royal person, honour, and estate; also the power and privilege of parliament, the lawful rights and liberties of the subject, and of every person who shall make this protestation in whatsoever he shall do, in the lawful pursuance of the same. And to my power, as far as lawfully I may, I will oppose, and by all good ways and means endeavour to bring to condign punishment, all such who shall by force, practice, counsel, plot, conspiracy, or otherwise, do any thing to the contrary in this protestation contained. And farther, that I shall in all just and honourable ways endeavour to preserve the union and peace between the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland; and neither for hope, fear, or any other respect, shall relinquish this promise, vow, and protestation."*

May 4, this protestation was made by all the peers present in parliament, except the earl of Southampton and lord Roberts;† even by the bishops themselves, though (as lord Clarendon‡ observes) it comes little short of the Scots covenant. Their lordships, indeed, would have interpreted those words, "the true reformed Protestant religion, expressed in the doctrine of the church of England," to have included the government or hierarchy of the church; but it was resolved and declared by the house,§ that by those words was and is meant,—only the public doctrine professed in the said church, so far as it is opposite to Popery and Popish innovations; and that the said words are not to extend to the maintenance of any form of worship, discipline, or government, nor of rites and ceremonies.‖—Within two days the protestation was taken by eighty temporal lords, seventeen bishops, nine judges, and four hundred and thirty-eight of the house of commons. Next day it was printed,

* Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 251, &c.

† "Alleging, that there was no law that enjoined it: and that the consequence of such voluntary engagements might produce effects, that were not intended." Lord Clarendon as quoted by Dr. Grey.—Ed.

‡ Vol. 1. p. 253.

§ Mr. Neal, according to lord Clarendon, has misrepresented this matter. For he says, that this explanation was procured in the house of commons, without ever advising with the house of peers. The peers had previously taken the protestation. Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. 2. p. 252. Mr. Neal is properly corrected here by Dr. Grey.—Ed.

‖ Rushworth, part 3 vol. 1.

and sent to the sheriffs and justices of peace in the several counties of England, to be taken by the whole nation, with the following directions.

—— "That it be taken in the afternoon of some Lord's day after sermon, before the congregation be dismissed, by all masters of families, their sons that are of a proper age, and men-servants, in the manner following. First, That notice be given to the minister by the churchwardens of the intention.—Secondly, That the minister acquaint the people in his sermon of the nature of the protestation.—Thirdly, That the minister first take it himself, reading it distinctly with an audible voice, that all present may hear it; then the assembly shall take the writing in their hands, saying with a distinct and audible voice, 'I A. B. do in the presence of Almighty God vow and protest the same, which the leading person that reads it did,' naming the person.—Fourthly, The names of all that take it shall be subscribed in a register; and the names of those that refuse shall be entered."

The cities of London and Westminister observed these directions, but the remoter counties were complained of for neglect; upon which the house of commons passed a bill to oblige all persons to take it throughout the kingdom; which was lost in the house of lords, the whole bench of bishops opposing it; whereupon the commons came to this resolution, that "whosoever would not take the protestation was unfit to bear offices in the church or commonwealth."

This was carrying matters to a very extraordinary length. There had been a parliamentary association in the reign of queen Elizabeth, which her majesty confirmed, and a solemn league and covenant in Scotland, which the king had complied with; but the enforcing a protestation or vow upon his majesty's subjects without his consent, was assuming a power, which even this dangerous crisis of affairs, and the uncommon authority with which this parliament was invested by the late act of continuance, can by no means support or justify. The odium of putting a stop to the protestation fell upon the bench of bishops, who were already sinking under their own weight: and his majesty's not interposing in this affair at all, was afterward made use of as a precedent for imposing the solemn league and covenant upon the whole kingdom without his concurrence.*

* Nalson's Col. vol. 2. p. 414.

The Puritans had also objected to the lordly titles and dignities of the bishops; but their votes in the house of peers were now esteemed a very great grievance, and an effectual bar to the proceedings of parliament. It was remembered that they had been always averse to reformation; that they had voted unanimously against the supremacy in king Henry VIII.'s reign; and against the act of uniformity in queen Elizabeth's. It was now observed that they were the creatures of the court, and a dead weight against all reformation in church or state; twenty-six votes being sufficient at any time to turn the scale in that house, whose full number was not above a hundred; it was therefore moved, that a bill might be brought in to take away their seats in parliament, which was readily agreed to. The bill, says lord Clarendon,* was drawn up with great deliberation, and was entitled, "An act for restraining bishops, and others of the clergy in holy orders, from intermeddling in secular affairs." It consisted of several branches, as, "that no bishop should have a vote in parliament, nor any judicial power in the star-chamber, nor be a privy-counsellor, nor a judge in any temporal courts; nor should any clergyman be in the commission of peace." To make way for the passing of this bill, it was alleged, that if this were granted the commons would be satisfied, and little or nothing farther attempted to the prejudice of the church. It therefore passed the house of commons without opposition, and was sent up to the house of peers May 1, 1641. Mr. Fuller says,† that lord Kimbolton would have persuaded the bishops to resign their votes in parliament, adding, that then the temporal lords would be obliged in honour to preserve their jurisdiction and revenues. The earl of Essex also employed somebody to treat privately with the bishops on the same head; but they rejected all overtures of accommodation, resolving to make their utmost efforts, and to keep possession of their seats till a superior strength should dispossess them; accordingly the bill met with a vigorous opposition in the upper house, and after a second reading was thrown out, without so much as being committed (a countenance frequently given to bills they never intend to pass); but the whole bench of bishops voting for themselves, it is no wonder it was lost by a considerable majority. Mr. Fuller

* Vol. 1. p. 451. † Book 9. p. 105.

says, it would have been thrown out if the bishops had not voted at all; for though the temporal lords were content to exclude them from all secular offices and employments in the state, they were in no disposition to take away their suffrages in the house of peers.

Many learned speeches were made in both houses upon this occasion; the reasons of the commons for passing the bill were these, (1.) Because their attendance on secular affairs, not relating to the church, is a great hinderance to their spiritual function.* "No man that warreth (saith St. Paul to Timothy) entangleth himself with the affairs of this life." (2.) Because it is contrary to their ordination-vow; for when they enter into holy orders they promise to give themselves wholly to that vocation. (3.) Because councils and canons in several ages have forbid their meddling in secular affairs. (4.) Because the twenty-four bishops depend on the two archbishops, and take an oath of canonical obedience to them. (5.) Because their peerage is not of the same nature with the temporal lords, being but for life. (6.) Because they depend on the crown for translation to greater bishopricks. (7.) Because it is not fit that twenty-six of them should sit as judges upon complaints brought against themselves and their order.†

Bishop Williams published an answer to these reasons, entitled the Abstract, to which there presently came out a reply. The chief speakers on behalf of the bishops, in the house of peers, were, the lord-viscount Newark, afterward earl of Kingston, Dr. Williams lord-bishop of Lincoln, afterward archbishop of York, the marquis of Hereford, the earls of Southampton, Bath, and Bristol. But instead of transcribing their speeches, I will give the reader a summary of their arguments, and of their adversaries' reply.

First, It was argued, that "bishops had voted in parliament almost ever since the Conquest, according to Matthew Paris, sir Henry Spelman, and others." To which it was

* Rushworth, p. 981. Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 260.

† On these reasons, Dr. Hartlib observes, "that, whatever might have been thought of them at that time, we are to suppose that they have long been of no force. The end for the constitution in church and state, the abhorrence of all ministerial measures inconsistent therewith, the opposition to every thing contrary to liberty and the public good; and above all, the self-denial, and contempt of the world, humility, and constant discharge of episcopal duties, required in the New Testament: I say, all these things shew how much the bishops since the Reformation are altered, and how much those are mistaken who represent them as a dead weight in the house of lords, and a useless expense to the public." Life of Charles I. p. 330, 331.

replied,* that time and usage ought to be of no weight with lawmakers, on the behalf of things which are allowed to be inconvenient: abbots had voted as anciently in parliament as bishops, and yet their votes were taken away.

Secondly, It was said, that "the bishops voting was no considerable hinderance in their spiritual function; for parliaments were to sit but once in three years, and then but for a month or two together; but though no clergyman should entangle himself with the affairs of this life, the apostle does not exclude him from intermeddling." To which it was answered, that the episcopal function, if well discharged, was enough for all their time and thoughts; and that their dioceses were large enough to employ all their labours, in visitation, confirmation, preaching, &c. The design of the apostle Paul was certainly to exhort Timothy to withdraw himself as much as possible from the affairs of this life, that his thoughts might be more entire for his evangelical work; and therefore, in another place, he exhorts him to give himself wholly to those things.

Thirdly, It was said, that "clergymen had always been in the commission of the peace, from the first planting of Christianity, and that they were best qualified for it." To which it was answered, that they were most unfit for this employment, because it had a direct tendency to hinder their usefulness in their pulpits; and to the fact it was replied, that the first clergymen that were made justices of the peace, or had power in temporal jurisdiction, were the bishops of Durham and York, 21 Edw. III. That before the act of conformity, 1 Edw. VI. the clergy were not put in commission for the peace; and that the reason of their being then admitted was, that they might persuade the people to conformity; but if in conscience they held it not consistent with their spiritual calling, they might refuse.

It was farther said, that the taking away one whole bench out of the house of peers was an ill precedent, and might encourage the commons one time or other to cut off the barons, or some other degree of the nobility. To which it was replied, that the peerage of the bishops did not stand upon the same footing with the rest of the nobility, because their honour does not descend to their posterity, and because they have no right to vote in cases of blood; if they had the same

* Neal's Collection, vol. 2. p. 5. 1, &c.

right of peerage with the temporal lords, no canon of the church could deprive them of it; for it was never known, that the canons of the church pretended to deprive the barons of England of any part of their inherent jurisdiction.

It was argued farther, that if the bench of bishops were deprived of their votes, they would be left under very great disadvantages; for whereas the meanest commoner is represented in the lower house, the bishops will be thrown out of this common benefit; and if they have no share in consenting to the laws, neither in their persons nor representatives, what justice can oblige them to keep those laws?

To which it was replied, that they have the same share in the legislature with the rest of the freeholders of England; nor is there any more reason that the bishops, as bishops, should be a part of the legislature, than the judges or the lawyers, as such, or any other incorporated profession of learned men.

But the principal argument that was urged in favour of bishops was, that "they were one of the three estates in parliament; that as such they were the representatives of the whole body of the clergy, and therefore to turn them out would be to alter the constitution, and to take away one whole branch of the legislature: the parliament would not then be the complete representative body of the nation, nor would the laws which were enacted in their absence be valid. To support this assertion it was said, (1.) That the clergy in all other Christian kingdoms of these northern parts, make up a third estate, as in Germany, France, Spain, Poland, Denmark, Scotland; and therefore why not in England? (2.) When king Henry V. was buried, it is said, the three estates assembled, and declared his son Henry VI. his successor. The petition to Richard duke of Gloucester, to accept the crown, runs into the name of the three estates; and in his parliament it is said expressly, that at the request of the three estates (i. e. the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons in parliament assembled), he was declared undoubted king of these realms; to which may be added, the statute of 1 Eliz. cap. 3, where the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, are said to represent the three estates of this realm.

It was replied to this, that the bishops did not sit in the house as a third estate, nor as bishops, but only in the right

of their baronies annexed to their bishopricks, 5 Will. I. All the bishops have baronies except the bishop of Man, who is as much a bishop, to all intents and purposes of jurisdiction and ordination, as the others, but has no place in parliament, because he does not hold *per integram baroniam*. It must be admitted, that in ancient times the lords spiritual are sometimes mentioned as a third estate of the realm, but it could not be intended by this, that the clergy, much less the bishops, were an essential part of the legislature; for if so, it would then follow, that no act of parliament could be valid without their consent; whereas divers acts are now in force, from which the whole bench of bishops have dissented, as the act of conformity, 1 Edw. VI. and the act of supremacy, 1 Eliz.* If the major part of the barons agree, and the house of commons concur, any bill may pass into an act with the consent of the king, though all the bishops dissent, because their votes are overruled by the major part of the peers. In the parliament of Northampton under Henry II. when the bishops challenged their peerage,† they said, "Non sedemus hic episcopi sed barones," We sit not here as bishops, but as barons;—we are barons, and you are barons, here, therefore we are peers. Nor did king Charles himself apprehend the bishops to be one of the three estates, for in his declaration of June 16, 1642, he calls himself one, and the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, the other two. In ancient times the prelates were sometimes excluded the parliament, as in 25 king Edw. I. when they would not agree to grant an aid to his majesty in the parliament at Carlisle; and before that time several acts had passed against the oppressions of the clergy, in which the entry in the records stands thus, "the king having consulted with the earls, barons, and the other nobles; or by the assent of the earls, barons, and other lay people;" which shews the bishops did not consent, for if they had, they would have been first named, the order of the nobility in all ancient records being prelates, earls, and barons.‡ When the convocation had cited Dr. Standish before them, for speaking words against their power and privilege, in the 7th Henry VIII. it was determined by all the judges of the land, in presence of the king, that his majesty might hold

* Nalson's Collections, vol. 2. p. 109, &c. † Fuller's Appeal.
‡ Rushworth, part 4. vol. 1. p. 460.

his parliament without calling the bishops at all. It appears therefore from hence, that the bishops never were accounted a third estate of the realm, in such a sense as to make them an essential branch of the legislature; nor are they the representatives of the clergy, because then the clergy would be twice represented, for as many of them as are freeholders are represented with their fellow-subjects in the house of commons; and as clergymen they are represented in convocation, the writ of election to convocation being to send two clerks *ad consentiendum*, &c. Besides, none can properly be called representatives of others, but such as are chosen by them; the bishops therefore, not being chosen for this purpose, cannot properly be the representatives of the clergy in parliament; they sit there not in their spiritual character, but by virtue of the baronies annexed to their bishopricks; and if the king, with consent of parliament, should annex baronies to the courts of justice in Westminster-hall, or to the supreme magistracy of the city of London, the judges and the lord-mayor for the time being would have the same right of peerage. But none of these arguments were deemed of sufficient weight with the lords to deprive them of their seats in parliament.

The loss of this bill with the resolute behaviour of the bishops, who were determined to part with nothing they were in possession of, inflamed the commons, and made them conclude, that there was no hope of reformation while they were a branch of the legislature. It was observed that the bishops were usually diligent in giving their attendance upon the house at this time, and always voted with the court. Some of the leading members therefore, in the warmth of their resentments, brought in a bill in pursuance of the root and branch petition, which had been laid aside for some time, for the utter extirpation of all bishops, deans, and chapters, archdeacons, prebendaries, chanters, with all chancellors, officials, and officers belonging to them; and for the disposing of their lands, manors, &c. as the parliament shall appoint.* A rash and inconsiderate attempt! For could they expect that the bishops should abolish themselves? Or that the temporal lords should consent to the utter extirpating an order of churchmen, when

* Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 13. 270. 400

they would not so much as give up one branch of their privilege? The bill being drawn up by Mr. St. John, was delivered to the speaker by sir Edward Deering with a short speech, in which he took notice of the moderation of the house in the late bill, hoping that, by pruning and taking off a few unnecessary branches from the bishops, the tree might prosper the better; but that this soft method having proved ineffectual, by reason of their incorrigible obstinacy, it was now necessary to put the "axe to the root of the tree."* "I never was for ruin (says he) as long as there was any hope of reforming; and I now profess, that if those hopes revive and prosper, I will divide my sense upon this bill, and yield my shoulders to underprop the primitive, lawful, and just episcopacy." He concluded with a sentence in Ovid.

Cuncta prius tentanda, sed immedicabile vulnus
Ense recidendum est, ne pars sincera trahatur.†

The reading of this bill was very much opposed, because it was brought in contrary to the usage of parliament without first asking leave; however, it was once read, and then adjourned for almost two months; a little before the king went to Scotland it was carried by a majority of thirty-one voices to read it a second time, and commit it to a committee of the whole house, of which Mr. Hyde [lord Clarendon] was chairman, who made use of so much art and industry to embarrass the affair, that after twenty days the bill was dropped.

Sir Edward Deering's speech in the committee will give light into the sentiments of the Puritans of these times;‡ "The ambition of some prelates (says he) will not let them see how inconsistent two contrary functions are in one and the same person, and therefore there is left neither root nor branch of that so good and necessary a bill which we lately sent up, and consequently no hope of such a reformation as we all aim at; what hopes then can we have, that this bill, which strikes at root and branch, both of their seats of

* Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 257. Nalson, ut ante, p. 219.

† Lord Clarendon represents sir Edward Deering as a man of levity and vanity, easily flattered by being commended; and says, "that the application of the above lines was his greatest motive to deliver the speech which they close. Dr. Harris (Life of Charles I. p. 127) says, he could not be actuated by so mean a motive; and that he was a man of sense, virtue, and learning, perhaps not inferior to his lordship, and of a family vastly superior." &c.

‡ Nalson's Collection, vol. 2 p. 270, &

justice, and of their episcopal chairs in the church, will pass as it is, and without a tender of some other government in lieu of this, since the voices are still the same which threw out your former bill."*—Sir Edward therefore proposed another form of government, if the house should think fit to abolish the present, which was in a manner the same with archbishop Usher's hereafter mentioned; as, "First, That every shire should be a distinct diocess or church. Secondly, That in every shire or church twelve or more able divines should be appointed, in the nature of an old primitive constant presbytery. Thirdly, That over every presbytery there should be a president, let him be called bishop, or overseer, or moderator, or superintendent, or by what other name you please, provided there be one in every shire, for the government and direction of the presbytery, in the nature of the speaker of the house of commons, or chairman of a committee." Accordingly it was resolved, July 10, "That ecclesiastical power for the government of the church be exercised by commissioners." July 31, resolved, "That the members for every county bring in the names of nine persons to be ecclesiastical commissioners, on whom the power of church-government shall be devolved; but that no clergyman be of the commission." This was designed as a temporary provision, and shews that the Puritans of these times did not intend the presbyterian government, but only a reduction of episcopacy to what they apprehended a more primitive standard; and if the bishops would have relinquished some part of their jurisdiction, the mischiefs that befel them afterward might have been prevented; however, for the present, the prosecution of it was laid aside.

But the house went more readily into the debate for abolishing deans and chapters, and applying their revenues to better purposes.† This alarmed the cathedral-men, and put them upon consulting how to ward off the danger that threatened them; for this purpose one divine was deputed from every cathedral in England, to solicit their friends in the houses on behalf of their several foundations; and it must be owned, they did all that men could do, leaving no stone unturned that might be for their advantage. Addresses

* Nalson's Collections, vol. 2. p. 295, &c.
† Fuller's Church History, b. 11. p. 170.

were presented from both universities in their favour:* the address from Oxford prays "for the continuance of the present form of church-government, as the most ancient and apostolical; and for the continuance of cathedral churches, with their lands and revenues, as dedicated to the service of God, soon after the first plantation of Christianity here; as foundations thought fit to be preserved, when the nurseries of superstition were demolished at the Reformation; as confirmed by the laws of the land; as nurseries of students and learned men in divinity; as the upholders of divers schools, hospitals, highways, bridges, and other pious works; as beneficial to those cities where they are situate, by hospitality, by relief of the poor, and by occasioning the resort of many strangers, to the benefit of the tradesmen and inhabitants of the places where they are built; as the chief support of many thousand families of the laity, who enjoy estates from them in a free way; and as yielding an ample revenue to the crown, and a maintenance to many learned professors in the university." The address from the university of Cambridge was to the same purpose, and therefore prays, "that the religious bounty of their ancestors, for the advancement of learning, and of learned men, may be preserved from ruin and alienation; but withal, to take order, that they may be reduced to the due observation of their statutes, and that all innovations and abuses may be reformed." The deputies from the several cathedrals drew up a petition to the lords and commons to be heard by their counsel; but being informed that the house would not allow them that benefit, and that if they had any thing to offer they must appear and plead their own cause; they made choice of Dr. John Hacket, prebendary of St. Paul's and archdeacon of Bedford, as their advocate, who being admitted to the bar of the house, May 12, after the petitions from the two universities had been read, made a laboured speech in their behalf, insisting chiefly on the topics of the Oxford address.

He recommended cathedrals, "as fit to supply the defects of private prayer;" the public performance whereof should be in some place of distinction.† And whereas the exquisiteness of the music gave offence to some ears, as hindering their devotion, he requested, in the name of his brethren, that it might be moderated to edification, and reduced to

* Nalson's Coll. vol. 2. p. 305, 306. † Fuller, b. 11. p. 177.

the form that Athanasius recommends, "ut legentibus sint quam cantantibus similiores."

He alleged, that "at the Reformation preaching began in cathedrals;" and whereas some have said, that lecture-preachers were an upstart corporation; the doctor observed, that the local statutes of all the cathedrals required lectures on the week-days; and he requested, in the name of his brethren, that the godly and profitable performance of preaching might be more exacted.

He urged, that "cathedrals were serviceable for the advancement of learning, and training up persons for the defence of the church;" and that the taking them away would disserve the cause of religion, and be a pleasure to their adversaries.

He added, that "the ancient and genuine use of deans and chapters was a *senatus episcopi*," to assist the bishop in his jurisdiction; and whereas some of his reverend brethren had complained, that bishops had for many years usurped the sole government to themselves and their consistories; the continuing of chapters rightly used would bring it to a plurality of assistants.

He then put them in mind of "the antiquity of the structures, and the number of persons maintained by them," amounting to many thousands; he instanced in their tenants, who by their leases enjoyed six parts in seven pure gain, and had therefore petitioned for their landlords; and shewed, that the cities in which cathedrals were built, were enriched by the hospitality of the clergy, and the resort of strangers.

He enlarged farther, "upon their endowments, as encouragements to industry and virtue;" that several famous Protestants of foreign parts had been maintained by being installed prebendaries, as, Casaubon, Saravia, Dr. Peter Du Moulin, Vossius, and others; that the crown had great benefit from these foundations, paying greater sums into the exchequer for first-fruits and tenths, according to proportion, than other corporations.

And lastly, he puts them in mind, that "these structures and estates were consecrated to divine service, and barred all alienation with the most dreadful imprecations."

In the afternoon Dr. Cornelius Burges appeared on the other side of the question, and made a long speech concerning the unprofitableness of those corporations; he com-

plained of the "debauchery of singing-men," and of their vicious conversation; he spoke against "music in churches" as useless and hurtful. He made a distinct answer to the particulars of Dr. Hacket's speech; and in conclusion said, "though he apprehended it necessary to apply these foundations to better purposes, it was by no means lawful to alienate them from public and pious uses, or to convert them to any private persons' profit."

The farther debate of this bill was adjourned for a week, and then committed to a committee of the whole house, when the two following remarkable speeches were made against these foundations.*

The first by Mr. Serjeant Thomas, who admits, "that there were deans in St. Austin's time, but that they were not officers of the church until some centuries after. St. Austin gives this account of their original; that the monks, for their more convenient retirement and contemplation, appointed officers, whom they called deans, 'eo quod denis sunt præpositi;' because every dean had the care of ten monks, and was to provide them all necessaries of life, that their devotions might not be interrupted with worldly cares. In the following ages of darkness and superstition, princes and others bestowed large revenues upon these monks, from the opinion they had of the austerity and sanctity of their lives; and as the monks grew rich, the office of the dean, who was the 'præpositus' or steward, grew more considerable, till in St. Bernard's time it was ordained, that none but a presbyter should be a dean: 'ne sit decanus nisi presbyter.' At the reformation of religion, when many other religious foundations were broke up, these were preserved, and in the constitutions of king Henry VIII. and Edward VI. it is ordained, that all deans should be presbyters, men of gravity, learning, and prudence, that they should govern the cathedral churches according to their several statutes; that they should preserve discipline, and see that the holy rites be performed in a grave and decent manner; that they be assistants to the bishops within their several cathedrals, as the archdeacons are abroad, for which reason they should not be absent from their cathedrals without the most urgent necessity, to be allowed by the bishop, but one or other of them is to preach in their cathedrals every Lord's day."

* Rushworth, part 1, vol. 1, p. [illegible]. Nalson's Coll. vol. 2, p. 282.

The serjeant then observed how unlike our present deans were to their predecessors; how little they observed the statutes of their institution, and gave it as his opinion, that it was not reasonable that such vast revenues should be allowed to persons who were of so little use to the church or commonwealth.

Mr. Pury, alderman of Gloucester, pursued the same argument; he produced a copy of the statutes of the dean and chapter of Gloucester, with their original grant about the time of the Reformation. "We have erected (says the king) cathedrals and colleges in the place of monasteries, that where ignorance and superstition reigned, the sincere worship of God might flourish, and the gospel of Christ Jesus be purely preached; and farther, that the increase of the Christian faith and piety, the instruction of youth in good learning, and the sustentation of the poor, may be for ever kept, maintained, and continued."* He then produced the statutes, which ordained, "that the said deans, prebends, and canons, shall always reside and dwell in the houses of the said cathedrals, and there keep a family, with good hospitality to feed the poor, and to distribute alms. That they should 'preach the word in season and out of season,' especially in the cathedral-church, and have youth profitably taught there. To this end they are to have a common table in the common-hall of the cathedral, where the canons, scholars, choristers, and under officers, are to eat together. The said dean and chapter are to give yearly 20*l.* to the poor, besides what is given to their own poor alms-men, and 20*l.* more to the repairing bridges and highways thereabouts. For the performance of the said statutes and promises, the deans, prebendaries, canons, and other ministers of the cathedral, are obliged to take an oath, and every one of them doth swear, that to the utmost of his power, he will observe them inviolably."

The alderman observes from hence, "that not one of the above-mentioned statutes are, or have been kept, or the matters in any of them contained, performed by any of the deans or prebendaries of the said cathedral in his memory. That they come once a year to receive the rents and profits of the lands, but do not distribute to the poor their proportion: nor do they mend the highways and bridges; nor do they keep

* Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 403.

any common table; and instead of preaching 'in season and out of season,' they neither practise it themselves, nor encourage it in others. Infinite are the pressures that many cities near unto deans and chapters have endured by them, and their procurement; so far have they been from a common benefit. Since then the said deans and chapters are but trustees, and the profits of the said lands have been so ill employed, contrary to the trust in them reposed, the alderman was of opinion, that by a legislative power in parliament it was fit to take them away, and to put them into the hands of feoffees, to be disposed of to such pious and charitable uses as they were first intended for; by which means the preaching of the gospel might be effectually encouraged, smaller livings augmented, and the necessities of the poor better supplied."

These speeches made such an impression upon the house, that after a long debate they came to these resolutions, "that all deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, prebendaries, chanters, canons, and petty canons, and their officers, shall be utterly abolished and taken away out of the church; and that all the lands taken by this bill from deans and chapters shall be put into the hands of feoffees, to be employed for the support of a fit number of preaching ministers the service of every church, and for the reparation of the said churches, provision being made, that his majesty be no loser in his rents, first-fruits, and other duties; and that a competent maintenance shall be made to the several persons concerned, if they appear not delinquents to this house." But none of these votes passed into a law; nor was there the least prospect of their being confirmed by the lords, as long as the bishops were in that house, who stood together like a wall against every attempt of the commons for alterations in the church, till, by an unexpected providence, they were broken in pieces, and made way for their own ruin.

The firmness of the bishops against all abatements or relaxations in favour of the Puritans, exasperated the people, and put an end to all prospect of agreement. A committee of accommodation had been appointed by the house of lords, March 12, to consider of such innovations in religion as were proper to be taken away, which by the plot of the court to bring up the army, and the loss of the late bills for

reformation of the hierarchy, was now broken up.* It consisted of ten earls, ten bishops, and ten barons. "This committee (says archbishop Laud in his diary) will meddle with doctrine as well as ceremony, and will call some divines to them to consider of the business, as appears by a letter hereunto annexed, sent by the lord-bishop of Lincoln to some divines to attend this service. Upon the whole, I believe this committee will prove the national synod of England, to the great dishonour of the church, and what else may follow upon it God knows." At their first meeting they appointed a sub-committee of bishops, and divines of different persuasions, to prepare matters for their debate; the bishop of Lincoln was chairman of both, and was ordered to call together the sub-committee with all convenient speed; which he did by a letter directed to each of them in the following words:

"I am commanded by the lords of the committee for innovations in matters of religion, to let you know, that their said lordships have assigned and appointed you to attend them, as assistants in that committee; and to let you know in general, that their lordships intend to examine all innovations in doctrine and discipline introduced into the church, without law, since the Reformation; and (if their lordships shall find it behoveful for the good of the church and state) to examine after that, the degrees and perfection of the Reformation itself, which I am directed to intimate to you, that you may prepare your thoughts, studies, and meditations, accordingly, expecting their lordships' pleasure for the particular points, as they shall arise. Dated March 12, 1640—1."

Their names were these:

Dr. Williams, bishop of Lincoln,	Dr. Holdsworth,
Dr. Usher, archbishop of Armagh,	Dr. Hacket,
Dr. Morton, bishop of Durham,	Dr. Twisse,
Dr. Hall, bishop of Exeter,	Dr. Burges,
Dr. Samuel Ward,	Mr. White,
Dr. John Prideaux,	Mr. Marshall,
Dr. Sanderson,	Mr. Calamy,
Dr. Featly,	Mr. Hill.
Dr. Brownrigge,	

* Laud's Diary, p. 61. History of his Troubles, p. 174.

Some others were named, but these were all who appeared: they consulted together six several days in the Jerusalem-chamber at Westminster, the dean entertaining them all the while at his table. The result of their conferences was drawn up for the debate of the committee, in certain propositions and queries under the following heads:

1.—*Innovations in Doctrine.*

1. "Quære, Whether in the twentieth article these words are not inserted, 'the church has authority in controversies of faith?'

2. "Several false doctrines have been preached, even all the doctrines of the council of Trent, abating only such points of state Popery against the king's supremacy, as were made treason by the statute; for example, some have preached justification by works; others, that works of penance are satisfactory before God; that private confession is necessary to salvation, *necessitate medii*; that absolution of a priest is more than declaratory; that the Lord's supper is a true and proper sacrifice. Some have defended prayer for the dead, and the lawfulness of monastic vows; some have denied the morality of the sabbath; some have preached, that subjects are bound to pay taxes, contrary to the laws of the realm; some have defended the whole substance of Arminianism; and others have given just occasion of being suspected of Socinianism.

3. "Several dangerous and reprovable books have been printed," which are mentioned in the copy of their proceedings, now before me.

2.—*Innovations in Discipline.*

As, 1. "Turning the holy table into an altar.

2. "Bowing towards it, or to the east many times, with three congees, at access or recess in the church.

3. "Placing candlesticks on altars in parochial churches in the day-time, and making canopies over them, with curtains, in imitation of the vale of the temple; advancing crucifixes and images upon the parafront or altar cloth, and compelling all communicants to come up before the rails.

4. "Reading the litany in the body of the church, and some part of the morning-prayer at the altar, when there

is no communion; and the minister's turning his face to the east when he pronounces the creed, or reads prayers.

5. "Offering bread and wine by the hands of the churchwardens, or others, before the consecration of the elements. Having a *credentia*, or side-table for the Lord's supper. Introducing an offertory before the communion, besides the giving alms to the poor afterward.

6. "Prohibiting ministers to expound the catechism; suppressing lectures on the week-day, and sermons on Sunday afternoon. Prohibiting a direct prayer before sermon; and bidding of prayer.

7. "Singing Te Deum in prose in parish-churches. Standing up at the hymns of the church; and always at Gloria Patri. Carrying children from baptism to the altar, to offer them to God; and prohibiting the building galleries in churches, where the parishes are very populous.

8. "Introducing Latin service in the communion at Oxford; and into morning and evening prayer in Cambridge.

9. "Pretending for their innovations the injunctions and advertisements of queen Elizabeth, which are not in force, but appertain to the liturgy, printed in the second and third of Edw. VI. which the parliament had reformed and laid aside."

Memorandum for Reformation.

1. "That in all cathedral and collegiate churches two sermons be preached every Sunday, and likewise every holiday; and one lecture at least on working days every week in the year.

2. "That the music used in cathedral and collegiate churches be framed with less curiosity; and that no hymns or anthems be used where ditties are framed by private men, but such as are contained in the Holy Scriptures, or in our liturgy or prayers, or have public allowance.

3. "That the reading desk be placed in the church, where divine service may be best heard of the people."

3.—Considerations upon the Book of Common Prayer.

1. "Whether the names of some departed saints should not be struck out of the calendar?

2. "Whether the rubric should not be mended, where

all those vestments are commanded which were used in the second year of Edward VI.?

3. "Whether lessons of canonical Scripture should not be inserted into the calendar instead of Apocrypha?

4. "In the rubric for the Lord's supper, whether it should not be inserted, that such as intend to communicate shall signify their names to the curate over night, or in the morning before prayers?

5. "The next rubric to be explained, how far a minister may repulse a scandalous and notorious sinner from the communion?

6. "Whether it be not fit to insert a rubric, touching kneeling at the communion, that it is to comply in all humility with the prayer which the minister makes, when he delivers the elements?

7. "Whether there should not be a rubric to take away all offence from the cross in baptism? Or, whether it be more expedient that it be wholly disused? And, whether this reason shall be published, that in ancient liturgies no cross was signed upon the party but where oil also was used, and therefore oil being now admitted, so may that which was concomitant with it, the sign of the cross?

8. "Whether the catechism may not receive a little more enlargement?

9. "Whether the times prohibited for marriage are quite to be taken away? Whether those words in the office, "With my body I thee worship," should not be thus altered,—I give thee power over my body? And, whether that part of the rubric, which obliges the new-married persons to receive the communion the same day of their marriage, might not be changed for the next Sunday, when the communion is celebrated?

10. "Whether in the absolution for the sick it were not better to say, I pronounce thee absolved? And in the office for the dead, instead of those words, 'in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life,' whether it were not better to say,—knowing assuredly, that the dead shall rise again."

Some other amendments of smaller moment were proposed, but these were the chief. No mention was made of a reformation of episcopacy, because their chairman the bishop of Lincoln had undertaken that province, and accord-

ingly presented the house of lords with a reconciling scheme, which was dropped after the first reading. It consisted of ten articles.

1. "That every bishop, being within his diocess, and not disabled by ill health, shall preach once every Lord's day, or pay 5*l.* to the poor, to be levied by the next justice of peace.

2. "That no bishop shall be a justice of peace, except the dean of Westminster in Westminster and St. Martin's. [This seems to be a proviso for himself.]

3. "That every bishop shall have twelve assistants besides the dean and chapter; four to be chosen by the king, four by the lords, and four by the commons, for jurisdiction and ordination.

4. "That in all vacancies, these assistants, with the dean and chapter, shall present to the king, three of the ablest divines in the diocess, who shall choose one to be bishop.

5. "That deans and prebendaries shall not be nonresidents at their cathedrals above sixty days.

6. "That sermons shall be preached in the cathedrals twice every Lord's day, once every holiday, and a lecture on Wednesdays, with a salary of one hundred marks per annum.

7. "That all archbishops, bishops, and collegiate churches, &c. shall be obliged to give a fourth part of their fines, and improved rents, to buy in impropriations.

8. "That all double-beneficed men shall pay the value of half their living to the curate.

9. "No appeal shall be made to the court of arches, or court of audience.

10. "It is proposed, that canons and ecclesiastical constitions shall be drawn up, and suited to the laws of the realm, by sixteen learned persons, six to be denominated by the king, five by the lords, and five by the commons."

Archbishop Usher offered another scheme, for the reduction of episcopacy into the form of synodical government, received in the ancient church; in which his grace supposes, that of the many elders that ruled the church of Ephesus, there was one stated president whom our Saviour calls the angel: and whom Ignatius, in one of his epistles, calls the bishop, to whom, in conjunction with the elders or presbyters, the whole government of the church, both as to

doctrine and discipline, was committed. He therefore proposes, that these be continued; and for a regulation of their jurisdiction, that suffragans should be appointed to hold monthly synods of presbyters, from whom there should be an appeal to diocesan, provincial and national ones; and more particularly,

1. "That the rector of every parish, with the churchwardens, should admonish and reprove such as live scandalously, according to the quality of their offence; and if by this means they are not reclaimed, to present them to the next monthly synod, and in the meantime debar them the Lord's table.

2. "Whereas by a statute of 26 Henry VIII. suffragans are appointed to be erected in twenty-six several places of this kingdom, the number of them may be conformed to the number of the several rural deaneries, into which every diocess is subdivided; which being done, the suffragan may every month assemble a synod of the several rectors or incumbent pastors within the precinct, and according to the major part of their votes conclude all matters that should be brought into debate before them.

3. "A diocesan synod might be held once or twice a year, wherein all the suffragans, and the rest of the rectors and incumbent pastors, or a certain select number out of every deanery, within that diocess, might meet, with whose consent all things might be concluded by the bishop or superintendent; or in his absence by one of his suffragans, whom he should appoint as moderator in his room; and here the transactions of the monthly synods may be revised and reformed.

4. "The provincial synod may consist of all the bishops and suffragans, and such of the clergy as should be elected out of every diocess within the province: the primate of either province might be moderator, or in his room, one of the bishops appointed by him. This synod might be held every third year, and if the parliament be sitting, both the primates and provincial synods might join together, and make up one national synod, wherein all appeals from inferior synods might be received, all their acts examined, and all ecclesiastical affairs relating to the state of the church in general established."

Several other proposals were made to the house of com-

mous by those Puritans, who were for revising and altering some things in the church, but not for root and branch:* as that his majesty should be moved to call a national synod, or a select number of divines of the three nations under his majesty's government; with an intimation to all reformed churches to send their deputies, to settle a uniform model of government for the church of England, to be confirmed by parliament, leaving to other nations a Christian liberty in those forms of discipline which are most agreeable to their civil government.

Others proposed, "that the present liturgy might be continued, but that the Apocryphal lessons be entirely omitted; that all sentences of Holy Scripture be according to the last translation; that the word minister be used instead of priest; with some other amendments.——That, with regard to episcopal government, bishops be obliged to constant preaching in their metropolitan or parochial churches;—that they never ordain without consent of three or four presbyters at least;—that they do not suspend by their sole authority, but with consent of presbyters, and that for weighty causes;—that none may be excommunicated but by the bishop himself, with consent of the pastor in whose parish the delinquent dwells; and that for heinous and very scandalous crimes only.—That the fees of ecclesiastical courts be regulated, and that bishops, chancellors, and their officials, may be subject to the censure of provincial synods and convocations."

But all these attempts for accommodation were blasted by the stiffness of the bishops, and by the discovery of the plot to bring the army to London to dissolve the parliament; this put the nation into a ferment, and widened the distance between the king and the two houses, upon which the committee broke up about the middle of May, without bringing any thing to perfection. Mr. Fuller has observed very justly, "that the moderation and mutual compliance of these divines might have saved the body of episcopacy, and prevented the civil war; but the court-bishops expected no good from them, suspecting the Doctrinal Puritans, (as they nicknamed those bishops and episcopal divines), joined with the disciplinary Puritans, would betray the church between them. Some hot spirits would abate no-

* Nal on's Collection, vol. 2. p. 203.

thing of episcopal power or profit, but maintained, that the yielding any thing was granting the day to the opposite party." It is the observation of another learned writer, upon the committee's agreeing to have the psalms in the liturgy printed according to the new translation; to expunge all Apocryphal lessons; to alter certain passages in the Book of Common Prayer; and some other things, with which divers of the Presbyterians said they were satisfied, "that if the episcopal men had made these concessions when they were in full power, they had prevented the mischiefs that were coming upon them; but as things were at present, neither side appeared very well satisfied."

There were deep resentments in the breasts of both parties; the bishops were incensed at the bold attacks of the house of commons upon their peerage and spiritual jurisdiction; and the Puritans had a quick sense of their former sufferings, which made them restless till they had abridged their power. It is very remarkable, and looks like an appearance of divine displeasure against the spirit of these times, that archbishop Usher's scheme, for the reduction of episcopacy, which at this time would have satisfied the chief body of the Puritans, could not be obtained from the king and the bishops; that afterward, when the king offered this very scheme at the treaty of the Isle of Wight, the parliament and Puritan divines would not accept it, for fear of breaking with their Scots brethren. Again, when the Presbyterian ministers, at the restoration of king Charles II. presented it to his majesty as a model with which they were satisfied, and which would comprehend in a manner their whole body, both the king and bishops rejected it with contempt, and would not suffer it to be debated.

It may not be improper in this place, to make a few remarks upon this part of Mr. Rapin's accurate and judicious history of England, who, in his account of these times, seems to represent the body of the Puritans to be presbyterians, and as having formed a conspiracy against the whole fabric of the church, from the very beginning of this parliament; whereas the state of the controversy between the church and the Puritans was now changed. In the reigns of queen Elizabeth and king James I. the Puritans were for the most part presbyterians, though even then there were many episcopalians among them; but from the time that Arminianism

prevailed in the church, and the whole body of the Calvinists came to be distinguished by the name of Doctrinal Puritans, both parties seemed to unite in a moderate episcopacy, there being little or no mention of the old book of discipline for twenty years before the commencement of the civil war, and all the controversy turning upon points of Calvinism; upon a reduction of the exorbitant power of the bishops; or upon innovations, as they were called, and ceremonies. There were few either among the clergy or laity, who had a zeal for presbytery, or desired any more than to be rid of their oppressions. Mr. Rapin, however, is of opinion,* that "among the members of parliament there were real presbyterians, who thought, no doubt, of altering the whole government of the church. These are represented as deep politicians, as working under ground, and making use of all kinds of artifices to accomplish their designs, which they took care not to discover." He owns, indeed, that "the presbyterians were not very numerous in the house, but that they were supported by a pretty great party in the kingdom, and particularly by the Scots;" which assertion seems to me to require stronger evidence than he has thought fit to produce. I have shewn from lord Clarendon, that both houses of parliament, at their first sitting down, were almost to a man for the constitution of the church; that they aimed at no more than a redress of grievances; and that there were not above two or three in both houses that were for root and branch. That all the members received the communion according to the usage of the church of England, at their first sitting down, and brought a certificate of their having so done. That the petition of the Puritan ministers, was not for setting up presbytery, but only for reforming the grievances of the hierarchy; the controversy between bishop Hall and the Smectymnuan divines, proceeded on the same footing, as did the committee of accommodation. In short, when the parliament was obliged to fly to the Scots for assistance in the war, and to receive their covenant; and when afterward they found it necessary to pay the utmost deference to their advices, lest they should withdraw their army, and leave them to the mercy of an enraged king, they could never, in the worst of times, be induced to establish their discipline in the church

* Vol. 2. p. 359. 417. folio edition.

of England, without a reserve of the ecclesiastical power to themselves. And as to the ministers who composed the assembly of divines at Westminster, though in a course of time they carried things very high, yet I am of opinion with Mr. Fuller,* that at first "they rather favoured the presbyterian discipline, or were brought over to embrace it by the Scots," than that they came thither possessed with sentiments of its divine authority. However, it is certain, that at the Restoration these very divines offered to give it up for archbishop Usher's model of primitive episcopacy.

It must be confessed, that soon after the beginning of the parliament there were many among the common people who were enemies to the whole ecclesiastical constitution, being supported by the Scots commissioners, who had conceived an implacable antipathy against the order of bishops, which they had voted contrary to the word of God. But this was not the case of the Puritan clergy, who wanted only to get rid of the tyranny of the bishops, and were willing to leave the parliament to model the government of the church as they pleased. And although as the influence of the Scots over the two houses increased, presbytery prevailed; and when the parliament were at their mercy, and forced to submit to what conditions they would impose upon them for their assistance, the kirk-discipline gained the ascendant, and at length advanced into a divine right in the assembly of divines; yet the parliament would never come into it, and when the Scots were gone home it dwindled by degrees, till it was almost totally eclipsed by the rising greatness of the Independents.

It appears therefore to me, that there was no formed design as yet, either in the house of commons or among the Puritan clergy, to subvert the hierarchy, and erect the presbyterian government upon its ruins; there were no considerable number of presbyterian ministers in the nation; and the leading members in both houses were known to be of another stamp. "We are confident (says the king, in his letter to the council of Scotland, August 26) that the most considerable persons in both houses of parliament, and those who make the fairest pretensions to you of uniformity in church-government, will no sooner embrace a presbyterial than you an episcopal."† And bishop Burnet

* Book 11. p. 190. † Hamilton's Memoirs, book 4. p. 197.

speaks the same language. So that what was done in the house of commons afterward, was the result of the situation of their affairs, and not of any formed design: as that changed, so did their councils and measures. The contrary to this ought not to be supposed, but proved by incontestable matters of fact, which neither Mr. Rapin, nor any other historian whom I have read, has yet done. And I will venture to say, that if there were such invisible presbyterians behind the curtain, who planned the subversion of the hierarchy, and blew it up as it were without hands, they must have been abler statesmen, and masters of much more worldly politics, than their posterity have ever been remarkable for.

To return to the parliament: There were two bills which affected the prerogative now ready for the royal assent; one to abolish the court of high-commission, and regulate the privy-council; the other to take away the star-chamber. To induce the king to pass them more readily, the commons sent up a money-bill with them; but when the king came to the house [July 3, 1641] he passed the money-bill, and told the houses, he must take some time to consider of the others; which disgusted the commons so much, that they returned to their house and immediately adjourned. At their next meeting they fell into new heats, which his majesty being informed of, came to the house of peers, and having sent for the commons, reprimanded them for their jealousies, and then passed the bills; he also put them in mind what he had done this session; "that he had yielded, that the judges should hold their places *quamdiu se bene gesserint*; that he had given away his right to ship-money; granted a law for triennial parliaments, and for securing the money borrowed for disbanding the armies; in a word, that he had hitherto given way to every thing, and therefore they should not wonder, if in some things he began now to refuse."* Lord Clarendon insinuates, that the king passed these bills with reluctance; from whence another ingenious writer concludes, that if ever the ministry had regained their power, it was likely they would advise his majesty to declare them void, as being extorted from him by force and violence.

The act for abolishing the high-commission court repeals

* Nalson's Collection, vol. 1. p. 327.

that branch of the statute 1 Eliz. cap. 1, upon which this court was founded, and then enacts, "that no archbishops, bishops, vicars-general, chancellor, or official, nor commissary, of any archbishop, bishop, or vicar-general, or any other spiritual or ecclesiastical officer, shall by any grant, licence, or commission, from the king, his heirs or successors, after the 1st of August 1641, award, impose, or inflict, any pain, penalty, fine, amercement, imprisonment, or other corporal punishment, upon any of the king's subjects, for any contempt, misdemeanour, crime, matter, or thing whatsoever, belonging to spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or shall *ex officio* tender or administer to any person, any corporal oath, to make any presentment of any crime, or to confess or accuse himself of any crime, offence, delinquency, or misdemeanour, whereby he or she may be liable to any punishment whatsoever, under penalty of treble charges, and *100l.* to him or them who shall first demand or sue for the same. And it is further enacted, that after the said 1st of August 1641, no new court shall be erected, or deemed, or appointed, that shall have the like power, jurisdiction, or authority, as the high-commission court had, or pretended to have, but all such commissions, letters patent, &c. from the king, or his successors; and all acts, sentences, and decrees, made by virtue thereof, shall be utterly void."

By the passing this act, all coercive power of church-consistories was taken away, and the spiritual sword, that had done such terrible execution in the hands of some bishops, was put into the scabbard. It was very extraordinary that the bishops, who were then in the house of lords, should so supinely suffer themselves to be surprised out of their power. Some were ready to observe a hand of justice, says Mr. Fuller,* that seeing many simple souls, by captious interrogatories, had been circumvented by the high-commission court into a self-accusation, an unsuspected clause in this statute should abolish all their lawful authority; for there is no proviso in the act to confine it only to the high-commission, but it extends to all archbishops, bishops, and all spiritual or ecclesiastical officers in any of their courts. Lord Clarendon says,† that the king was apprehensive that the body of the bill exceeded the title, and therefore made a pause in consenting to pass it, but that

* Book 11. p. 191. † Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 261.

some bishops prevailed with his majesty to sign it, to take off the odium from that bench, of their being enemies to all reformation; for it was insinuated, says the noble historian, that since they opposed a due regulation of their power, there would be no way but to cut them off root and branch.

The act for taking away the star-chamber, and regulating the privy-council, dissolves the said court from the 1st of August 1641, "and repeals all those acts, or clauses of acts of parliament, by which any jurisdiction, power, or authority, is given to the said court, or to any of the officers or ministers thereof. And it ordains farther, that neither his majesty, nor his privy-council, have, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, or authority, by English bill, petition, articles, libel, or other arbitrary way, to examine or draw in question, determine or dispose of, the lands, tenements, hereditaments, goods, or chattels, of any of the subjects of this kingdom."

Thus fell the two chief engines of the late arbitrary proceedings in church and state, which had the liberties and estates of many worthy and pious families to answer for. By the proviso in the act for abolishing the high-commission, that "no new court shall be erected with like powers for the future," it appears how odious their proceedings were in the eyes of the nation. Lord Clarendon admits,* that the taking away the star-chamber at this time was very popular; but is of opinion that it would be no less politic in the crown to revive it when the present distempers are expired; however, I rely on the wisdom of a British parliament, that they will never consent to it.

When the king had signed the two bills, he desired the advice of his parliament, concerning a manifesto which he intended to send to the diet of Ratisbon in favour of the Palatine family, wherein he declares, that he will not abandon the interests of his sister and nephews, but will employ all his force and power in their behalf until they are restored. This was highly acceptable to the Puritans, who had always the interest of that house at heart. The manifesto was read July 7,† when the commons declared their approbation of it, and resolved to give his majesty such assistance therein as shall stand with the honour of his majesty,

* Vol. 1. p. 285. † Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 310.

and the interest and affections of his kingdom, if the present treaty does not succeed. The peers concurred in the same vote, and both houses desired the king to recommend it to the parliament of Scotland; which his majesty promised. Many warm speeches were made on this occasion in favour of the queen of Bohemia, by sir Simon D'Ewes, Mr. Denzil Hollis, and sir Benjamin Rudyard.* "The restoring the prince to his electorate (says sir Benjamin) will restore the Protestant religion there; it will strengthen and increase it in Germany, which is of great and vast consequence. It will likewise refresh and comfort the heart of that most noble, virtuous, and magnanimously-suffering, queen of Bohemia his majesty's sister, and his highness's mother, who is ever to be highly and tenderly regarded by this house, and by this kingdom."—Mr. Denzil Hollis said, "The house of commons looks upon those distressed princes of so glorious an extraction, with an eye of tenderness, wishing every drop of that princely blood may ever be illustrated with honour and happiness.—To hear that these princes should have their patrimony taken from them, and suffer things so unworthy their birth and relation, is a thing that makes our ears to tingle, and our hearts to rise within us.—But there is another motive which has an irresistible operation with us, which is the advancement of Protestant religion.—The Protestant religion and this kingdom must live and die together; and it is madness to suppose the Protestant religion can continue here, if we suffer it to be destroyed and eradicated out of the neighbouring countries.—Religion is the heart of England, and England is the heart of the Protestant religion in all the other parts of Christendom; let us therefore, like wise men, that foresee the evil afar off, rather meet it at a distance, than stay till the Austrian ambition and Popish power come to our door."† These were the sentiments of the Puritans in this parliament, with respect to the ancestors of his present majesty, and the Protestant religion. The queen of Bohemia was so sensible of their particular regards for her family, that she returned them her thanks; but the manifesto ended in nothing.‡

The commons not being able to come at their intended alterations in the church, while the bench of bishops remain-

* Nalson's Collection, p. 340—340, 370. † Rushworth, p. 316. ‡ Ibid. p. 357.

ed united in the house of peers, formed several schemes to divide them: it was first proposed to set large fines upon both houses of convocation for compiling the late canons, and a bill was brought in for that purpose; but upon better consideration it was thought more effectual for the present, to make examples of those bishops only, who had been the principal movers in that affair; agreeably to this resolution a committee was appointed July 31, to draw up an impeachment against one half of the bench, viz. Dr. Laud archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Curle bishop of Winchester, Dr. Wright bishop of Coventry and Litchfield, Dr. Goodman bishop of Gloucester, Dr. Hall bishop of Exeter, Dr. Owen bishop of St. Asaph, Dr. Pierse bishop of Bath and Wells, Dr. Wren bishop of Ely, Dr. Roberts bishop of Bangor, Dr. Skinner bishop of Bristol, Dr. Warner bishop of Rochester, Dr. Towers bishop of Peterborough, Dr. Owen bishop of Landaff.* The impeachment was of high crimes and misdemeanours, "for making and publishing the late canons, contrary to the king's prerogative, to the fundamental laws of the realm, to the rights of parliament, and to the property and liberty of the subject; and containing matters tending to sedition, and of dangerous consequence; and for granting a benevolence or contribution to his majesty, to be paid by the clergy of that province, contrary to law." It was carried up to the lords August 4, by serjeant Wild, who demanded, in the name of all the commons of England, that the bishops might be forthwith put to answer the crimes and misdemeanours above mentioned, in the presence of the house of commons; and that such farther proceedings might be had against them as to law and justice appertained. The commons were in hopes, that the bishops would have quitted their votes in parliament to be discharged of the præmunire; but they resolved to abide by their right, and therefore only desired time to prepare their answer, and counsel for their assistance; accordingly they were allowed three months' time to put in their answer, and counsel of their own nomination, viz. serjeant Jermin, Mr. Chute, Mr. Herne, and Mr. Hales.†

From this time the bishops fell under a general disregard; the cry of the populace was against them, as the chief im-

* Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 309.

† Fuller's Church History, book 11. p. 183.

pediments of all reformation in church and state; and even the temporal peers treated them with neglect, expressing their dislike at the bishop of London being styled Right Honourable. Besides, the lords spiritual were not distinctly mentioned in the bills that passed this session, according to ancient usage; the clerk of the parliament, in reading the bills to the house, turned his back upon the bench of bishops; and when the houses went in a body to church on a fast-day, the temporal barons gave themselves precedence of the bishops. These were the preludes to their downfal, which happened about six months forward, though from this time they were little better than ciphers in the house.

These resolute proceedings against the bishops, put the court upon forming new projects to break up the parliament. It was observed that the strength and courage of the house of commons rose from their confederacy with the Scots, whose army in the north was entirely in their interest; it was therefore resolved in council to detach that nation, if possible, from the parliament, and to bring them over to the king, by yielding every thing they should desire; for this purpose his majesty declared his resolution to the two houses, to visit his native country in person within fourteen days, and desired them to finish the bills which were before them by that time. The commons being aware of the design, and apprehensive of danger, if the king should put himself at the head of the English army in the north, sent away the earl of Holland immediately with money to pay them off, which was done without mutiny or disturbance; but the business of the houses being very urgent, and the time short, they voted, that in this case of great necessity, concerning the peace of the kingdom, they would sit the next day, being Sunday, by six o'clock in the morning; which they did, and having heard a sermon, returned to the house about nine, and sat all day long on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday [August 8, 1641]. But lest this might be misconstrued as a profanation, or be drawn into example, they published the following declaration:*

"Whereas both houses of parliament found it fit to sit in parliament upon the 8th of August, being Lord's day, for many urgent occasions, being straitened in time, by his majesty's resolution to go within a day or two to Scotland, they

* Rushworth, p. 693. Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 136.

think fit to declare, that they would not have done this but upon inevitable necessity; the peace and safety of both church and state being so deeply concerned, which they do hereby declare, to this end, that neither any other inferior court or council, or any other person, may draw this into example, or make use of it for their encouragement, in neglecting the due observation of the Lord's day."

The same vote passed the house of lords *nemine contradicente*, and was ordered to be printed.

August 10, his majesty came to the house and gave his assent to a bill concerning knighthood; against the oppressions of the stannary courts; for regulating the clerks of markets; and for confirming and ratifying the peace [or pacification] with the Scots. This last being an affair of great consequence, I shall give the reader an abstract of the treaty, which had been depending ever since November 23, 1640, between the commissioners of both nations, who agreed to the following conclusions [August 7], which the king ratified and confirmed the very day he set out for Scotland.

"That the acts of parliament held at Edinburgh June 2, be published by his majesty's authority, and have in all time to come the full strength of laws.

"That the castle of Edinburgh, and other forts of Scotland, should be furnished and used for the defence of the kingdom, with the advice of the states of parliament.

"That all those who in England or Ireland have been imprisoned, or otherwise censured for subscribing the covenant, and for refusing to take the oath contrary to the same, shall be released and freed from such censures; and for the time to come, the subjects of Scotland living in Scotland, shall not be obliged to any oaths contrary to the laws or religion of that kingdom; but if they come to reside in England or Ireland, they shall be subject to the laws as others are.

"That all his majesty's courts of justice shall be free and open against all evil counsellors and delinquents; that the parliament of Scotland shall have liberty to proceed against such; and that his majesty will not employ any person, in any office or place, who shall be judged incapable by sentence of parliament; nor make use of their service, nor grant them access to his royal person, without consent of parliament.

"That all ships and goods on both sides be restored, and that 300,000*l.* be given to the Scots by the English, for their friendly assistance and relief.

"That all declarations, proclamations, &c. that have been published against the loyalty and dutifulness of his majesty's subjects of Scotland be recalled and suppressed; and that at the close of the treaty of peace, the loyalty of his majesty's said subjects shall be made known at the time of public thanksgiving in all places, and particularly in all parish-churches, of his majesty's dominions.

"That the garrisons of Berwick and Carlisle be removed, and all things be reduced to the state they were in before the late troubles.

"Whereas unity in religion, and uniformity in church-government, have been desired by the Scots, as a special means for preserving the peace between both kingdoms, his majesty, with the advice of both houses of parliament, doth approve of the affection of his subjects in Scotland, in their desire of having a conformity of church-government between the two nations. And as the parliament hath already taken into consideration the reformation of church-government, so they will proceed therein in due time, as shall best conduce to the glory of God, the peace of the church, and both kingdoms.

"That the prince of Wales shall be permitted to repair into Scotland, and reside there, as there shall be occasion.

"That his majesty will give ear to the informations of parliament, and when that is not sitting, to the council and college of justice, so far as to make choice of some one of such, as they, by common consent, shall recommend to places of trust in the council, the session, and other judicatures. Or if his majesty shall think any other person fit, he shall acquaint his parliament, to the intent, that if by their information any just exception shall be made to the said person, his majesty may nominate another.

"That some noblemen, &c. of the Scots nation, shall be placed about the king; and that his majesty will endeavour to give just satisfaction to his people, with regard to his placing none but persons of the reformed religion about his own and the prince's person."

Then follows an act of oblivion, with exception to the Scots prelates, and four others; and in the close the ratification of the whole in these words:

"Be it enacted by his majesty, with the assent of the lords and commons in this present parliament assembled, that the said treaty, and all the articles thereof, be and stand for ever ratified and established, and have the force, vigour, strength, and authority, of a law, statute, and act of parliament.—And his majesty for himself and his successors promises, in *verbo principis*, never to come in the contrair of this statute and sanction, nor any thing therein contained, but to hold the same in all points firm and stable, and cause it to be truly observed, according to the tenor and intent thereof, now and for ever.—And the parliaments of both kingdoms respectively give full assurance, and make public faith, for the true and faithful observation of this treaty, &c. *hinc inde*, in all times to come."

Bishop Burnet very justly observes a collusion in the king's approving the desire of his Scots subjects for uniformity of church-government. His majesty wished it as much as they, but with a very different view; the king was for bringing them to the English standard, whereas the Scots intended to bring the English to theirs. However, his majesty was resolved to contradict them in nothing, that he might break the confederacy between the two nations; for lord Saville had now informed him of the correspondence of some of the English nobility with the Scots, which encouraged them to raise an army and march to the borders. He had shewn him a copy of the letter, with the forged names of Essex, Bedford, Mandeville, and others, exciting them to assert the liberties of their church and nation, and promising all the assistance they could give with safety to themselves. His majesty therefore resolved to gain over the Scots, that he might be at liberty to prosecute the inviters, and recover his prerogative in England, which he knew he could accomplish by the assistance of the Irish, if the English Puritans were left to themselves. The parliament were aware of the design, and therefore appointed one lord and two commoners to follow his majesty to Scotland, in order to keep up a good correspondence with the parliament of that nation, and to exhort them, since they had gained their own liberties by the assistance of the English parliament, not to desert them till the English also had recovered theirs.

The king set out post August 11, 1641, and arrived at Edinburgh in three or four days. The parliament met Au-

gust 19, when his majesty acquainted them in a most gracious speech, that the end of his coming into his native country, was to quiet the distractions of the kingdom, "and this I mind (says his majesty) fully and cheerfully to perform, for I assure you, I can do nothing with more cheerfulness than to give my people general satisfaction; wherefore not offering to endear myself to you in words, which is not my way, I desire in the first place to settle that which concerns religion, and the just liberties of this my native country, before I proceed to any other act."* Accordingly his majesty allowed of their late proceedings in opposing the English liturgy, and erecting tables in defence of their liberties; he confirmed the acts of their assembly at Glasgow, which declared, that "the government of the church by archbishops and bishops was contrary to the word of God, and was therefore abolished." The reverend Mr. Henderson waited on the king as his chaplain, and was appointed to provide preachers for him while he was in that country, his majesty having declared, that he would conform to their manner of worship while he was among them. Mr. Henderson had the rent of the royal chapel; Mr. Gillespie had a pension, and the professors of the several universities had their provisions augmented, by the revenues formerly belonging to the bishops. His majesty conferred titles of honour upon many of their gentry; and all parties were so well pleased, that it was said, when his majesty left the kingdom, that he departed a contented king from a contented people.

No sooner was the king returned but the English bishops reproached his majesty with his concessions, especially for admitting "the English hierarchy to be contrary to the word of God." They told him he had unravelled the web which his father and himself had been weaving in that country for above forty years, and instead of making the Scots his friends, he had only created a new thirst in the English parliament to follow their example. These remonstrances had such an influence upon the unhappy king, that he repented heartily of what he had done, and told Dr. Saunderson afterward bishop of Lincoln, when he was in the Isle of Wight, that two errors did much afflict him, his consenting to the earl of Strafford's death, and his abolishing episcopacy in Scotland; and that if God should ever restore him to the

* Rushworth, part 3, vol. 1. p. 362.

peaceable possession of his crown, he would demonstrate his repentance by a public confession and a voluntary penance (I think says the doctor) by going barefoot from the Tower of London, or Whitehall, to St. Paul's, and desiring the people to intercede with God for him. This shews how much superstition still remained in his majesty's make and constitution, when he could imagine, the going barefoot through the streets could atone for his mistakes; and how little dependance was to be had upon his promises and declarations; that even in the year 1648, when the necessity of his affairs obliged him to consent to a uniformity of presbyterian government in both nations, he could declare in private to his chaplain, that "if he was ever restored to his throne, he would do public penance for abolishing episcopacy in Scotland." Upon the whole, the king's journey into his native country did him no service; for though the Scots were pleased with his majesty's concessions, they durst not depend upon them as long as he was under the direction of the queen and the English bishops, and they continued to think themselves obliged from gratitude, affection, and interest, to cultivate a good understanding with the English parliament, and to assist them in recovering their religion and liberties.

Upon the day of thanksgiving for the pacification between the two nations [September 7], bishop Williams dean of Westminster, without any direction from his superiors, composed a form of prayer for the service of the day, with which the house of commons were offended, and came to this resolution, "that the bishop of Lincoln had no power to set forth any prayer to be read on the public thanksgiving; and that no minister is obliged to read the said prayer; and the house is of opinion and doth order, that the said prayer be not read in the liberties of Westminster, or elsewhere."* Dr. Burges and Mr. Marshall preached before the commons, and read the following order, appointed by both houses to be published in all the churches throughout England, with his majesty's consent.

"Whereas according to the act of this present parliament, for confirmation of the treaty of pacification, it was desired by the commissioners of Scotland, that the loyalty and faithfulness of his majesty's subjects [of Scotland] might

* Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 476, 477.

be made known at the time of thanksgiving, in all places, and particularly in all parish-churches of his majesty's dominions; which request was graciously condescended to by his majesty, and confirmed by the said act: it is now ordered and commanded by both houses of parliament, that the same be effectually done in all parish-churches throughout this kingdom, on Tuesday, September 7, at the time of the public thanksgiving, by the respective ministers of each parish, or their curates, who are hereby required to read this present order in the church."

The order being read, the ministers declared, that notwithstanding all which had passed in the late commotions, the Scots nation were still his majesty's faithful and loyal subjects. Thus as the calling and continuance of an English parliament, after twelve years' interval, was owing to the marching of the Scots army into the north of England, it was by the powerful support and assistance of that parliament, and the expense of a million of money, that the Scots obtained the present pacification, with the full recovery of their kirk-discipline and civil liberties.

In the midst of this ferment of the spirits of men, the workings of opposite counsels, and the taking the sword out of the hands of the spiritual courts, it is not to be wondered that the state of religion was unsettled, and that men began to practise with some latitude in points of ceremony and forms of worship. It has been observed, that in the beginning of the year, the house of commons had ordered commissioners to be sent into all the counties of England, for removing the late innovations. June 28, it was farther ordered, "that neither university should do reverence to the communion-table." And August 31, "that the churchwardens of the several parishes shall forthwith remove the communion-table from the east end of the churches where they stand altarwise, and take away the rails and level the chancels, as before the late innovations." Upon complaint of the want of sermons, and that the incumbents in many places would not admit preachers into their pulpits, though the parish maintained them, it was ordered, June 14, "that the deans and chapters of all cathedrals be required, and enjoined, to suffer the inhabitants to have free liberty to have a sermon preached in their cathedrals every Sunday in the afternoon." July 12, ordered, "that in all parochial

churches where there is no preaching in the afternoon, if the parishioners will not maintain a conformable lecturer at their own charge, the parson or vicar shall give way to it, unless he will preach himself." September 6, ordered, "that it be lawful for the parishioners of any parish to set up a lecture, and to maintain an orthodox minister, at their own charge, to preach every Lord's day where there is no preaching, and to preach one day every week where there is no weekly lecture."* But notwithstanding these votes, some bishops inhibited preaching on Sundays in the afternoon; and in particular Dr. Montague, bishop of Norwich, upon which the commons voted, "that his lordship's inhibition of the reverend Mr. Carter to preach in his own parish-church, was void; and that every minister may preach in his own parish-church as often as he pleases."

Many petitions being sent from divers counties for preaching ministers, a committee of forty members of the house, called the committee for preaching ministers, was appointed to send ministers where there were vacancies, and to provide for their maintenance.† These gentlemen recommended many of the late silenced ministers, as, the reverend Mr. Case, Mr. Marshall, Sedgwick, Burroughs, whom some of the vicars refused to admit into their pulpits, or at least dissuaded their parishioners from hearing them, upon which some of them were required to attend the committee; and because great complaints were made to the house, of the idleness and viciousness of the country clergy, another committee was appointed to examine into such complaints, and was called the committee for scandalous ministers.‡

* Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 286. 303. 475. † Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 295.

‡ "By 'scandalous ministers' (says Dr. Grey) no more was meant than the being truly orthodox, truly conformable to the rules and orders of the church, and faithful and obedient subjects to his majesty." It is sufficient to oppose to this rapid assertion of Dr. Grey, an authority not to be controverted, that of Fuller, Church History, b. 11. p. 207. He informs us, that some of the clergy were outed for their affection to the king's cause merely, and many were charged with delivering false doctrines, whose positions were found at the least disputable: and urges, that many of the complainers were factious people, and the witnesses against the clergy seldom deposed on oath; yet, after these deductions, he allows that many were outed for their misdemeanours; and adds, "some of their offences were so foul, it is a shame to report them, crying to justice for punishment." He appears indeed, to have his doubts, whether their crimes were sufficiently proved; for if the proof were perfect, the persons ought to have lost their lives, and not their livings only. This is, however, a proof against Dr. Grey's unlimited assertion, that in many instances the imputation of scandalous crimes, supported by considerable evidence at least, was the ground of proceeding. Mr. Baxter tells us, that it was no sooner understood, that the committee was formed, than multitudes in all counties came up with petitions against their ministers. Two hundred of the names of scandalous ministers, their places, and articles proved against them, were published by Mr. White, the chairman of the committee: and moderate

The day before the recess of the parliament [September 8, 1641], it was resolved by the commons, "that the Lord's day should be duly observed and sanctified; that all dancing, or other sports either before or after divine service, be forborne and restrained; and that the preaching God's word be promoted in the afternoon, in the several churches and chapels of this kingdom; and that ministers and preachers be encouraged thereunto. The chancellors of the two universities, the heads of colleges, all patrons, vicars, and churchwardens, are to make certificate of the performance of these orders; and all defaulters to be returned to parliament before the 30th of October next.——Ordered farther, that all crucifixes, scandalous pictures of any one or more persons of the Trinity, and all images of the Virgin Mary, shall be taken away and abolished;, and that all tapers, candlesticks, and basins, be removed from the communion-table.—That all corporal reverences at the name of Jesus, or towards the east end of the church, chapel, or chancel, or towards the communion-table, be forborne."* These orders to be observed in all cathedral and collegiate churches and chapels, in the two universities, by the respective officers and ministers of these places, and by the readers and benchers of the inns of court.†

The house of lords consented to some of these resolutions, but not to all. They agreed in their committee, "that no rails should be placed about the communion-table, where there were **more** already, but not to the pulling down all that were set up; and that all chancels raised within fifteen years past should be levelled; that images of the Trinity should be abolished, without limitation of time; and all images of the Virgin Mary erected within twenty years past."‡ But as for bowing at the name of Jesus, they insisted that it should be left indifferent. So that when the question was put, to agree or not agree with the resolutions of the commons, it passed in the negative, eleven against nine. The commons therefore published their resolutions apart, and desired the people to wait patiently for the intended reformation, without any disturbance of the worship

men were grieved to see so much ignorance, and such gross immoralities exposed to the derision of the world. And yet Dr. Grey could say, that scandalous ministers meant no more than the loyal and orthodox. Baxter's Life, part 1. p. 19, folio.—Ed.

* Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 492. † Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 386.

‡ Ibid. p. 482, 483.

of God, and of the peace of the kingdom. Upon which the lords in a heat appointed their order of Jan. 19, 1640—1, already mentioned, to be reprinted,* "that divine service should be performed as it is appointed by act of parliament; and that all who disturb that wholesome order shall be severely punished according to law. That all parsons, vicars, and curates, in their several parishes, do forbear to introduce any rites or ceremonies that may give offence, otherwise than those that are established by the laws of the land." This was voted by twelve of the lords present, the other six entering their protest;† after which both houses adjourned for six weeks. Mr. Rapin observes,‡ that there seems no necessity for the lords to renew this order; and that it was done out of spleen and revenge, because the commons had made a declaration against innovations, and it was not doubted but the bishops were the chief authors of it.

Lord Clarendon represents the putting these orders of the house of commons in execution, as a transcendent presumption, and a breach of the privilege of the house of lords; and though in one place his lordship acknowledges, that little or nothing of moment was done in pursuance of the orders of the two houses, yet upon this occasion he says,§ "that seditious and factious persons caused the windows to be broken down in churches, tore away the rails, removed the communion-tables, and committed many insolent and scandalous disorders, and that if any opposed them they were sent for before the committee." But the fairest account of this matter may be gathered from Mr. Pym's report to the house at their first meeting after the recess.

"The committee of religion (says he) have sent down divers of your declarations into the country, and have found, that in some places where there were good ministers they were retained, and in other places neglected. We cannot say there have been any great tumults, though the execution of the orders of the house has occasioned something tending that way. In some parishes they came to blows, and in others they would have done the like, if care had not been taken to prevent it. At St. Giles's Cripplegate, the parishioners were almost at daggers drawing about the rails

* Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 387. Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 293.
† Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 485. ‡ Vol. 2. p. 382, folio.
§ Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 29.

of the communion-table, which they would not suffer to be removed. The like opposition was made to the orders of the house at St. George Southwark, St. Mary Woolnoth, St. Botolph Aldersgate, and a few other places; but in most places they were quiet."

If the innovations complained of were according to law, neither lords nor commons had authority to remove them, for in a time of public peace and tranquillity a vote of parliament cannot suspend or set aside the laws; but if they were apparently contrary to law, I do not see why either house of parliament, or even the parishioners themselves, by a vote of their vestry, might not order them to be taken away. Remarkable are the words of sir Edward Deering to this purpose; "The orders of the house (says he) are, doubtless, powerful, if grounded upon the laws of the land; upon this warrant we may, by an order, enforce any thing that is undoubtedly so grounded; and by the same rule we may abrogate whatsoever is introduced contrary to the undoubted foundation of your laws; but we may not rule and govern by arbitrary and disputable orders, especially in matters of religion."*

The lords disapproved of the tumultuous attemps of private persons, and punished them severely. Complaint being made by the inhabitants of St. Saviour's Southwark, of certain persons who had pulled down the rails of the communion-table in an insolent and riotous manner, they were sent into custody, and having been heard by their counsel at the bar of the house, the churchwardens of the parish were ordered to set up new rails, at the costs and charges of the offenders, in the manner they had stood for fifty years before, but not according to the model of the four or five last years.† The rioters also were enjoined to make a public confession of their fault in the body of the church on a sabbath-day when the congregation should be present, and to stand committed to the Fleet, during the pleasure of the house.‡ Upon another complaint of the parishioners of St. Olave's Southwark, against others that had made a tumult in their church, and used irreverent speeches during the administration of the sacrament; the delinquents were sent into custody, and after hearing they were com-

* Rushworth, vol. 1. part 3. p. 391. † Nalson's Coll. vol. 2. p. 271, 322.
‡ Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 401, 402.

mitted to the King's-bench for six months, without bail or mainprize; and ordered to stand upon a high stool in Cheapside and in Southwark, for two hours on a market-day, and to acknowledge their fault publicly: they were also fined 20*l.* and to find sureties for their good behaviour; but when they had been imprisoned about a month, upon their humble petition, and acknowledgment of their misdemeanours, they were released.*

If we may give credit to the petition from Canterbury, things were every where in great confusion; for it says, "that the religion and government by law established, has been of late most miserably distracted by ill-affected persons, by whose means the houses of God are profaned, and in part defaced; the ministers of Christ are contemned and despised; the ornaments, and many utensils of the church are abused; the liturgy and Book of Common Prayer depraved and neglected; that absolute model of prayer, the Lord's prayer, vilified; the sacraments of the gospel, in some places, rudely administered, in other places omitted; solemn days of fasting observed, and appointed by private persons; marriages illegally solemnized; burials uncharitably performed; and the very fundamentals of religion subverted by the publication of a new creed, and teaching the abrogation of the moral law; many offensive sermons are preached, and many impious pamphlets printed. Lord Clarendon says,† that the pulpits were supplied with seditious and schismatical preachers. That in order to poison the hearts of the king's subjects, care was taken to place such ministers and lecturers in the most popular towns and parishes, as abhorred the present government and temperature of the church and state;" and then adds, "I am confident there was not from the beginning of this parliament, one orthodox or learned man recommended by them to any church in England." Strange! when scarce one was recommended who had not been educated in our own universities, and subscribed all the doctrinal articles of the church of England! But his majesty's language is more severe in his declaration of August 12, 1642. "Under pretence of encouraging preaching (says he) they have erected lectures in several parishes, and commended such lecturers as were men of no learning nor conscience, but furious promoters

* Nalson's Coll. vol. 2. p. 555. † Vol. 1. p. 295.

of the most dangerous innovations; many having taken no orders, yet were recommended by members of either house to parishes; and when mechanic persons have been brought before them for preaching in churches, and have confessed the same, they have been dismissed without punishment, and hardly with reprehension. All persons of learning and eminency in preaching, and of sober and virtuous conversation; of great examples in their lives, and even such as among these men had been of greatest estimation, and suffered somewhat for them, were discountenanced, and such men cherished who boldly preached against the government of the church, against the Book of Common Prayer, against our kingly lawful power, and against our person. Farther, a licence even to treason is admitted in pulpits, and persons ignorant in learning and understanding, turbulent and seditious in disposition, scandalous in life, and unconformable in opinion to the laws of the land, are imposed upon parishes, to infect and poison the minds of our people."——

What character the parliament-divines had for learning, for orthodoxy of doctrine, and sobriety of manners, will appear hereafter. The commons in their reply to his majesty's declaration, denied the whole of this charge, and averred, "that they were careful in their inquiries into the learning and morality of those whom they recommended; that they were not for encouraging faction and schism, but for preferring those who were for a parliamentary reformation in church and state. That they had shewn their resentments against mobs and tumults, and against the preaching of laymen;"* for when they were informed that Mr. Robinson, Spencer, Banks, Durant, and Green, being mere laymen, had presumed to preach publicly, they sent for them [June 7], and reprimanded them by their speaker in these words; "The house has a great distaste of your proceedings; and if you offend at any time in the like kind again, this house will take care you shall be severely punished."

Far be it from me to apologize for the furious preachers of these times; though it will appear hereafter, that the complaints of the royalists are very much exaggerated. It was certainly a great disadvantage to the parliament's cause,

* Nalson's Coll. vol. 2. p. 265. 270.

that they could not get a good supply of learned and able preachers, the keys of admission into holy orders being at this time in the hands of the bishops, who were very strict in their examination into the political principles of those they ordained; this reduced the committee to the necessity of admitting some few who came well recommended from New England or Scotland, and had been only ordained by presbyters; and such young students, who, producing their testimonials from the universities, were allowed to preach for some time as candidates. They were under the like disadvantage as to presentations or inductions, most of them being in the hands of the king and the bishops.

The archbishop of Canterbury continued to ordain clergymen of his own principles in the Tower; whereupon the house of lords ordered [October 28], that his jurisdiction should be sequestered, and administered by his inferior officers, till he should be acquitted of the charge of high treason that was against him. His grace often admitted such clergymen to livings as were obnoxious to the two houses, insomuch that the lords found it necessary to enjoin him to acquaint their house with the names of such persons as he nominated to any ecclesiastical benefice, promotion, or dignity, within his disposal, to be approved of first by the house, before they were collated or instituted. On the other hand, when a minister was chosen by the parishioners, and recommended to his grace for admission, if he did not like his principles and character, he would either except against him, or suffer the living to lapse to the crown. This created him new enemies, and kept alive the resentments of the commons. At length the archbishop acquainted the king with his case, who sent him a peremptory letter, requiring him "that as often as any benefice, or other spiritual promotion, should become void within his gift, to dispose of it only to such persons as his majesty should nominate; and that if either or both houses should command him otherwise, he should then let it fall in lapse to the crown." As soon as the houses were acquainted with this, they published an order of their own, requiring the archbishop to dispose of no benefice or spiritual promotion that should become void at any time before his trial, without the leave and order of the two houses at Westminster. Such was the struggle between the king and parliament for the

pulpits! It being thought of great consequence on both sides, to fill them with men of their own principles, who would be zealous in the cause in which they were severally engaged.

All the bishops were under a cloud, and in no degree of favour either with the parliament or people, except the bishop of Lincoln, who, having some years been in prison, had no share in the late innovations. This prelate, in the recess of parliament, visited his diocess; and exhorted the people in his sermons to keep to their lawful minister, and not go after tub-preachers in conventicles. He acquainted them with the laws, and told them that no power could protect them from the penalty of statutes unrepealed. "Look back (says his lordship) from the beginning of queen Elizabeth. Can the gospel stand better against the church of Rome, than it has done under the bishops, liturgy, and canons? Therefore don't abandon the good old way, for another which you do not know how much evil may be in it." But his rhetoric had very little effect; nor did the parliament approve of his conduct, at a time when his majesty was out of the kingdom, and when it was resolved to attempt some considerable alterations in the hierarchy.

The distractions in the state were no less threatening than those of the church. The plague was in the city of London, which dispersed the members, so that they could hardly make a house. The disbanding the army infested the roads with highwaymen, insomuch that is was hardly safe to travel from one town to another. The officers (many of whom were Papists) crowded to London, and took lodgings about Covent-garden and Whitehall, under pretence of receiving the remainder of their pay; these behaved with unusual insolence, and struck terror into minds of the people. The mob was frequently up in one part of the town or another; one while they threatened the pope's nuncio, and another while the queen-mother, upon which they retired out of the kingdom; but the queen herself stood by her friends; she had a convent of capuchins in her court, and protected great numbers of the king's subjects and others, from the sentence of the laws. The lord-mayor was commanded to bring in a list of Popish recusants about London; and all the Papists in the several counties were ordered to be disarmed; "which though it had little or no

effect (says lord Clarendon*), served to keep up fears and apprehensions in the people of dangers and designs;" which will appear presently not to have been groundless. This was the melancholy state of the nation, when on a sudden it was thunderstruck with the surprising news of one of the most barbarous massacres of the Protestants in Ireland, that the records of any age or nation can produce.

Lord Clarendon is of opinion, that the parliament, instead of adjourning, should now have broken up and returned home, since the principal grievance of church and state had been redressed, and the constitution secured by the act for triennial parliaments. But not to trouble the reader with affairs of state; what religious grievances were actually redressed? except the shortening the power of the spiritual courts, by the acts for abolishing the court of high-commission and star-chamber? not one of the late innovations was abolished by law; nor was there any alteration in the liturgy, or form of church-government. The sole power of the bishops in ordination and jurisdiction remained to be regulated; nor was there any reformation of deans and chapters; all which the Puritans hoped for and expected. In short, the whole government of the church remained entire, notwithstanding the fierce attacks of the commons against it. The act for triennial parliaments will appear not to have been a sufficient security to the constitution, if we consider how many acts of parliament the king and his arbitrary ministers had broke through the last fifteen years; that his majesty had still the same principles, and was likely to be in the same hands upon the dissolution of this parliament. Besides, it was said that these laws had been extorted form him by force, and therefore were not binding; and if a parliament should be called after three years, that it was dissolvable at pleasure; so that in all probability things would have returned to the old channel if the parliament had now dissolved themselves. Supposing therefore, but not admitting, that the principal grievances of church and state had been redressed, I leave it with the reader, whether in the present situation of affairs, a mere redress of past grievances was sufficient without some security against the return of the like in time to come.

* Vol. 1. p. 290.

Among the remarkable divines who died about this time was Dr. John Davenant bishop of Salisbury, born in London, and educated a fellow-commoner in Queen's college, Cambridge, of which he was afterward master, and lady Margaret professor in the same university. He was a celebrated Calvinist, and one of those divines appointed by king James to represent the church of England at the synod of Dort, where he behaved with great prudence and moderation; and upon his return to England was preferred to the bishoprick of Salisbury; but in the beginning of the reign of king Charles he became obnoxious to the court, for venturing to preach on the doctrine of predestination, contrary to his majesty's declaration, and was forced to make his submission before the privy-council. He was a quiet and peaceable prelate, humble and charitable, a strict observer of the sabbath, an enemy to the pomp and luxury of the clergy, and one who lamented the high proceedings of the court. He had a great reputation in foreign parts for profound learning, and an unblemished life; and after he had enjoyed his bishoprick about twenty years, ended his days in peace and honour, April 20, 1641, a little before the beginning of the troubles that afterward came upon the church and kingdom.* He died of a consumption, and a few hours before his death prayed pathetically for a quarter of an hour, "blessing God for his fatherly correction, forasmuch as his whole life having been full of mercy, he had been ready to doubt, whether he was a true child of God till this last sickness."†

Dr. Richard Montague, bishop of Norwich, was a divine of a different character; he was born in Westminister, educated in Eaton-college, and afterward fellow of King's college. Mr. Fuller says he was a celebrated Grecian, and church antiquary, well read in the fathers, but a superstitious admirer of church-ceremonies.‡ He was a thorough

* Fuller's Worthies, b. 2. p. 247; and Church History, b. 11. 176

† This eminent and worthy prelate was a benefactor to Queen's college in Cambridge; giving to it the perpetual advowsons of the rectories of Chevrel-Magna and Newton-Tony in Wiltshire, and a rent-charge of 5*l.* 10*s.* per annum for the founding of two Bible clerks, and buying books for the library in the same college. Biogr. Britan. vol. 5. second edit. p. 1831. Ed.

‡ Fuller's words, as Dr. Grey observes, are, "but all his devotion being not so well skilled in antiquity as himself, some charged him with superstitious urging of ceremonies." He is allowed to have urged ceremonies, but according to Fuller and Dr. Grey, that is not superstition, though they be unauthorized by Scripture, if they be sanctioned by antiquity. Ed.

Arminian, a creature of archbishop Laud's, and an ill instrument between the king and parliament in the late times, and therefore voted unfit for any church-preferment; but when the king resolved to govern without parliaments, his majesty preferred him first to the bishoprick of Chichester, and then to Norwich, where he shewed his zeal for the church, by a vigorous and illegal prosecution of the Puritans. He was accused by the present parliament, for superstitious innovations; and would no doubt have felt their resentments, if he had not gone, as Mr. Fuller expresses it,* a more compendious way, to answer for all his proceedings in the high court of heaven. He died April 12, 1641.

The Rev. Mr. John Eaton, M. A. and vicar of Wickham-Market, was born in Kent 1575, and of a peculiar mould, says Mr. Echard,† very paradoxical in his opinions, and reckoned a great Antinomian, and one of the founders of that sect, for which he more than once suffered imprisonment. His chief performance was a book entitled, "The honey-comb of free justification by Christ alone;" for which he was imprisoned in the Gate-house at Westminster. Mr. Echard admits, that by means of his zeal, his exemplary patience, and piety, he was exceedingly admired in the neighbourhood where he lived, and strangely valued for many years after his death. In truth, though he committed some mistakes in his assertions about the doctrine of grace, he was nevertheless, says Mr. Archdeacon, a pattern of faith, holiness, and cheerfulness, in his sufferings, to succeeding generations. He died in the sixty-seventh year of his age.

CHAP. X.

FROM THE REASSEMBLING OF THE PARLIAMENT, TO THE KING'S LEAVING HIS PALACE OF WHITEHALL, JANUARY 10, 1641—2.

Before his majesty left Scotland, advice came to London [November 1] of a general insurrection of the Papists in Ireland, and of a most cruel and bloody massacre of the

* Book 11. p. 194. † Ath. Ox. vol 2. p. 1—6.

Protestants of that kingdom.* The project of an insurrection was formed in the months of March and April 1641, not without the privity of the English court, and executed October 23 following; no information of it having been given to the Protestants till the very night before it was to take place, when it was too late to prevent the effects of it in the country, and almost to save the city of Dublin itself. When the express that brought the news was read in the house, it produced a general silence for a time, all men being struck with horror. When it was told without doors it flew like flashes of lightning, and spread universal terror over the whole kingdom. Every day, and almost every hour, produced new messengers of misery, who brought farther intelligence of the merciless cruelty of the Papists towards the poor Protestants, whose very name they threatened to extirpate out of the kingdom.

On the day appointed, between twenty and thirty thousand of the native Irish appeared in arms in the northern counties, and having secured the principal gentlemen, and seized their effects they murdered the common people in cold blood, forcing many thousands to fly from their houses and settlements, naked into the bogs and woods, where they perished with hunger and cold. No ties of friendship, neighbourhood, or consanguinity, were capable of softening their obdurate hearts, in a cause which they called "the cause of loyalty and religion." Some they whipped to death; others they stripped naked and exposed to shame, and then drove them, like herds of swine, to perish in the mountains; many hundreds were drowned in rivers; some had their throats cut; others were dismembered. With some the execrable villains made themselves sport, trying who could hack

* A fair judgment of this horrid affair, it may be observed, cannot be formed without considering it in connexion with the causes that led to it. It should be viewed as the result of various circumstances, which for a course of years had irritated the minds of the Irish, and at last raised them to a pitch of frenzy and cruelty, of which we cannot read without being shocked at the recital. The Irish had been pursued with a constant, rigorous, and unremitting persecution. They had suffered extortions, imprisonments, and excommunications. Their estates had been seized under the pretext of a judicial inquiry into defective titles, in which inquiry verdicts against them were extorted from jurors. They had been heavily taxed for their superstitions, and totally precluded the exercise of their religion. Their application to Charles I. for a toleration had been scornfully rejected, in consequence of a protestation against it, drawn up by the primate Usher, and twelve bishops. The detail of their sufferings may be seen in "Jones's letter to the united societies of Belfast." By which it will appear, that from the Reformation they had been the victims of religious persecution and civil devastation, as, to the author's words, almost to justify, but certainly to extenuate, the dreadful outrageous period of 1641.—Ed.

deepest into an Englishman's flesh. Husbands were cut to pieces in the presence of their wives; wives and young virgins abused in the sight of their nearest relations; nay, they taught their children to strip and kill the children of the English, and dash out their brains against the stones. Forty or fifty thousand were massacred after this manner in a few days, without distinction of age, sex, or quality, before they suspected their danger, or had time to provide for their defence. In a few weeks the insurrection was so general, that they took possession of whole counties, murdering the inhabitants, plundering their houses, and killing or driving away their cattle. Multitudes of poor distressed creatures and families fled naked and half starved, first to Dublin, and from thence to England, with death and despair in their countenances. At length the Irish army having ravaged all the northern counties, blocked up the city of Dublin itself, with all the poor distressed Protestants who had taken sanctuary in it; but not being masters of the sea, the city was relieved, and part of the country secured, till the parliament was at leisure to pour out all their vengeance upon the heads of the murderers, by the hands of the victorious and terrible Oliver Cromwell.

The frequent expresses which pressed one after another to England, with the multitudes of distressed creatures that got passage into several parts of the kingdom, filled the hearts of all true Protestants with infinite conjectures, and prodigious imaginations of treasonable designs against this as well as the neighbouring kingdom. They were afraid, and not without reason, that a second part of this tragedy might be acted on themselves; the parliament therefore ordered themselves a guard of train-bands, and entered immediately into measures to secure the nation from the impending storm.

But before we dismiss the Irish insurrection and massacre, it will not be improper to trace it from its original, and inquire into the authors, and the several parties concerned in it. The earl of Antrim and sir Phelim O'Neal, who were at the head of the Irish Catholics, having acquainted the pope's nuncio, and some of the priests about the queen, how easily they could assume the government of Ireland, and assist the king against the English Puritans, letters were

written in the queen's name, and perhaps in the king's,* authorizing them to take up arms and seize the government.† The Irish received the orders with pleasure; and concluded farther among themselves, that it was necessary at the same time to extirpate the Protestants out of that kingdom before they could with safety transport their army into England. That this was their design, appears from their remonstrance, published upon the very day of the insurrection, in which they say, "that having some liberty of religion granted them by the king, they perceived the parliament was wresting his majesty's prerogative from him, in order to extinguish their religion; therefore to support his majesty's prerogative, and to confirm his royal and ever happy love to them, they had taken up arms; and accordingly bound themselves to one another by the following oath:

"That they would maintain the Roman-Catholic religion; that they would bear true faith and allegiance to the king and his heirs, and defend him and them with their lives and estates, against all persons that should endeavour to suppress the prerogative, or do any acts contrary to regal government, to the power and privilege of parliaments, and to the rights and privileges of the subject."

They called themselves the queen's army, and published a proclamation from their camp at Newry, declaring that they acted by the king's commission, under the great seal of Scotland, dated at Edinburgh October 1, 1611, and by letters under his sign manual, of the same date with the commission; which I believe, with lord Clarendon, was a forgery; though it is a little unaccountable, that his majesty should never, by any public act or declaration of his own, clear himself of so vile a calumny. However, though the king gave out no commission, there is too much reason to

* Dr. Grey is severe in his animadversions on Mr. Neal's insinuation, that the English court and even the king were privy to the Irish insurrection. Bishop Warburton, on the same ground, has impeached our author's candour and impartiality: our reply to whom, in the two following notes, will serve as an answer to Dr. Grey. I will add here, that Mr. Baxter says, "that the soberer part could not believe that the Irish rebels had the king's commission." His Life, p. 29, folio. Indeed it was passed on the credulous with the name, by affixing to it the great seal taken off from some grant or patent. The distinction which Mr. Neal attempts to make between the insurrection and the massacre, is justified by what bishop Burnet asserts in a passage quoted in the beginning of the paragraph, where this distinction occurs. Rushworth's Collection, part 3. vol. 1, p. 402. Ed.

† Prynne's Introduction, p. 220. 252. Burnet's History, Life, and Times, vol. 1. p. 55. Edinburgh edit. Rushworth, vol. 4. p. 398, &c.

believe,* that the queen and her Popish council, and even the king himself, were not unacquainted with the design of an insurrection before it took place; and that her majesty gave it all the countenance she could with safety: but when these bloody butchers overacted their parts to such a degree, as to massacre near two hundred thousand Protestants in cold blood, to make way for their tyranny, it was time for all parties to disown them.

Bishop Burnet observes, "that in the first design of an insurrection there was no thought of a massacre; this came into their heads as they were contriving methods of executing it; and as the people were governed by the priests, these were the men that set on the Irish to all the blood and cruelty that followed." There was a consultation at the abbey of Multifernan in the county of West-Meath, where it was debated, what course should be taken with the Protestants; some were for expelling them, as the king of Spain did the Moors; others pressed to have them universally cut off; but not coming to a conclusion, they left the army to act at discretion.† How far the pope's nuncio and the queen's council might be consulted about the massacre, is a secret; if we distinguish between the insurrection, in order to assume the government into the hands of the Irish Papists, and the massacre which attended it, we may conclude without any breach of charity, that the English court‡ admitted of the former, though they might wash their hands of the latter.

The parliament, in their declaration of March 9, 1641, say, that the rebellion in Ireland was framed and contrived in England, and that they had taken several depositions, proving, that the English Papists were to raise about the

* Bishop Warburton taxes the following insinuations against the king as being "certainly very unjust and groundless." The reader will observe, that Mr. Neal's insinuations go no farther than that the king was acquainted with, if he did not encourage, the design of the Irish to appear in arms. He by no means charges him with consenting or being privy to the massacre. As to the hand he had in the rebellion, two modern historians have, with great candour, fully stated the evidence *pro* and *con*. Dr. Harris in his Life of Charles I. p. [illegible]. And Mrs Macaulay, vol. 3. p. 84–93, the note. From the arguments stated by those writers it will appear, that there were certainly grounds for Mr. Neal's insinuations, and if so, they cannot be very unjust. Ed.

† Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 633

‡ If by the court here be meant the king, bishop Warburton condemns Mr. Neal, as, "scandalously uncharitable." It is most reasonable to explain Mr. Neal by himself; and the parties whom he particularized, in this very sentence, are, the queen and the pope's nuncio.—Ed.

same time;* that the rebels said they acted by the king's authority; that they called themselves the queen's army, and declared, that "their purpose was to come to England after they had done in Ireland, to recover the royal prerogative, wrested from him by the Puritan faction in the house of commons." Mr. Pym declared in parliament, that several disbanded officers and soldiers of the king's army went over to Ireland, and listed among the rebels by the king's express warrant, which his majesty denied; but when the matter was examined, it appeared that his authority had been abused by some who were very near his person.

The concern of the court in this dark affair is farther evident, from the relation of the earl of Essex, who told bishop Burnet, "that he had taken all the pains he could to inquire into the original of the Irish massacre, but could not see reason to believe the king was accessory to it; but he did believe that the queen did hearken to the propositions made by the Irish, who undertook to take the government of Ireland into their hands, which they thought they could easily perform, and then they promised to assist the king against the hot spirits at Westminster. With this the insurrection began, and all the Irish believed the queen encouraged it.

There was a farther discovery of this fact at the restoration of king Charles II. when the marquis of Antrim, who had been at the head of the rebellion, and whose estate had been confiscated, finding himself likely to be excluded the act of indemnity, came to London to petition his majesty to examine the warrants he had acted upon. Accordingly a committee of council was appointed, and the marquis produced some letters from the king, which did not amount to a full proof; but in one of them the king says, that he was not then at leisure, but referred himself to the queen's letter, and said, that was all one as if he writ himself.† Upon this foundation the marquis produced a series of his own letters to the queen, in which he gave her an account

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 119, [illegible] edition.

† To invalidate the [illegible] from the defence which the marquis of Antrim set up, Dr. Grey [illegible] that the [illegible] had not the [illegible] or fact in [illegible] evidence [illegible] by the Rev. Thomas Cart, in a piece entitled, "The Irish [illegible]," [illegible] Dr. Harris notice the same [illegible] Mr. [illegible] matter, and says, that "[illegible] Antrim had [illegible] in the first rebellion in Ireland." [illegible] Late of Charles I. p. 550.—Ed.

of every one of those particulars that were laid to his charge, and shewed the grounds he went upon, and desired her majesty's direction to every one of these: and he had answers ordering him to do as he did. This affair, says the bishop,* the queen herself, who was then at court, espoused with great zeal, and said, she was bound to save him. So a report was drawn up by the committee, declaring, that he had fully justified himself in every thing; but the earl of Northumberland, who was chairman, refused to set his hand to it, saying, "he was sorry the marquis had produced such warrants; but he did not think that they ought to serve his turn, for he did not believe that any warrant from the king or queen could justify so much bloodshed, in so many black instances as were laid against him." Upon the earl's refusing to sign the report the rest of the committee declined it, and there it dropped; whereupon the king himself wrote over to the duke of Ormond, that he had so vindicated himself, that he must get him included in the act of indemnity; but the lord Mazarine and others not being satisfied to give their vote in favour of such a criminal, notwithstanding the instructions they had received from England, the marquis was obliged in his own defence to produce in the house of commons a letter from king Charles I. wrote with his own hand, giving him express orders to take up arms;† upon which he was pardoned, and his estate restored.

* Burnet's Hist. Life, and Times, vol. 1. p. 54, 55. Edin. ed.

† Here Dr. Grey asks, "And what is all this to the Irish massacre? The letter, it is plain, related to his joining Montrose in Scotland." To prove this the doctor appeals to the letter of king Charles II. quoted in the next paragraph; in which his majesty expressly allows, that the marquis was instructed to draw some forces from Ireland for the service of Scotland. And, on the authority of Mr. Carte, he refers to an act of parliament, anno 1617, 1618, Car. II. in which the king, speaking of his letter to the duke of Ormond, says, "It was only to declare, that the marquis of Antrim was employed in Ireland to procure what forces he could from thence, to be transported into Scotland for his late majesty's service, under the late marquis of Montrose." Whoever reads king Charles II.'s letter which is given at full length in Ludlow's "Truth brought to light," a pamphlet printed in 1698, in answer to Dr. Hollingworth, will not think the limitation of his majesty's meaning, here offered, consistent with the strain and tenor of that letter, which refers to the Irish rebellion in the most general terms, as well as speaks of "drawing some forces from the Irish for the service of Scotland;" and alludes to various other actings of the marquis with the Irish confederates. It was proved, on the trial of the marquis's claim to be included in the act of indemnity, that he was to have had a hand in surprising the castle of Dublin, in 1641; and seven other charges were substantiated against him. After a trial of seven hours, the king's letter being opened and read in court, Rainford, one of the commissioners, said, "that the king's letter on his behalf was evidence without exception;" and thereupon he was declared an innocent Papist. Truth brought to Light, p. 15. The plea of this letter, was the instructions given to the marquis by Charles I. and, as Mr. Neal's quotation states, it applied to every transaction with the

In the letter of king Charles II. to the duke of Ormond above mentioned, under his majesty's own hand, and entered in the signet-office July 13, 1663,* there is this remarkable passage, "that the referees who had examined the marquis [of Antrim's] case, had declared to him, that they had seen 'several letters, all of them of the hand-writing of our royal father to the said marquis,' and several instructions concerning his treating with the Irish in order to the king's service, by reducing them to their obedience, and by drawing some forces from them for the service of Scotland. That besides letters and orders under his majesty's own hand, there was sufficient evidence and testimony of several messages and directions sent from our royal father and our royal mother, with the privity and direction of the king our father, by which it appears, that whatever correspondence or actings the said marquis had with the confederate Irish Catholics, was directed and allowed by the said letters and instructions; and that the king himself was well pleased with what the marquis did after he had done it, and approved of the same."

I have been more particular in accounting for this insurrection, because whoever were the authors of it, they are, in the judgment of lord Clarendon, answerable for all the calamities of the civil war. "It was Ireland (says his lordship†) that drew the first blood. If they had not at that time rebelled, and in that manner, it is very probable all the miseries which afterward befel the king and his dominions, had been prevented." At whose door then the guilt of all this blood must be laid, I freely leave with the reader.

Upon the first news of the Irish massacre the commons turned themselves into a committee of the whole house, and came to the following resolutions, "that all Roman Catholics of quality in the several counties of England be secured, and that all Papists depart from London to their respective places of abode in the country; that the house of lords be desired to join with the commons in a petition for dissolving the convent of Capuchins, and sending them out

---

Irish Catholics. Ludlow avers it as a well-known fact, that the marquis had his hand and hands deeply and early engaged in the bloody work of the rebellion, and was amongst the first in it. Memoirs, 1to. p. 4[illegible], edition of 1771. As to the act of parliament, to which Mr. Carte refers, it is not to be found in the statutes at large, 4to. nor in Pickering's statutes. Vo

* Ludlow's Memoirs, vol. 1. p. [illegible] † Vol. 1. p. 299.

of the kingdom; that the foreign ambassadors be desired to deliver up such priests of the king's subjects as are in their houses; that a list be brought in of the queen's servants; and that a proclamation be issued out for all strangers that are not Protestants, to give an account of their names and places of abode, or depart the kingdom." They also dispatched a messenger to the king, beseeching him to concur with them in securing the nation against any farther attempts of the Papists; and not to employ any in his councils who were favourers of Popery, superstition, or innovation in religion. They voted 200,000*l.* to be borrowed immediately for the service of Ireland, and appointed the train-bands of Westminster to guard them from the insolence and affronts of vagrant soldiers about the court, and to secure them from other designs which they had reason to suspect. The lords ordered all Romish recusants to remove out of the inns of court and chancery. The commons ordered the oaths of allegiance and supremacy to be tendered to all Irish gentlemen within those courts; "for it now appears (says Mr. Pym) that the religion of the Papists is incompatible with any other religion, it is destructive to all others, and will endure nothing that opposes it. There are other religions that are not right, but not so destructive as Popery, for the principles of Popery are subversive of all states and persons that oppose it."*

When the king returned from Scotland the latter end of November, and had been received with the acclamations of the citizens of London,† he was prevailed with by the queen and her faction to check the proceedings of the two houses, since the Scots were easy, and the hearts of the English nation seemed to be with him; his majesty had recommended the suppressing the Irish rebellion to the Scots representatives, and by letter had committed the care of it also to the English parliament; whereupon the house of commons, in the king's absence, authorized the earl of Leicester, by an ordinance of their own, to raise forces, and the lord high-admiral to provide shipping for their transportation from Chester, and other ports; but when the king came to Whitehall he seemed so unwilling to act against the Papists, that the parliament were afraid of sending Protestant soldiers out of the kingdom, lest his majesty should take advantage

* [illegible] Collection, vol. [illegible] p. [illegible] † Ibid. p. [illegible], &c.

of their absence, and break up the constitution;* for he had already commanded away the parliament's guard, telling them they had nothing to fear from the Papists, and that their jealousies of plots and massacres were imaginary.† He pardoned seven Popish priests who were under sentence of condemnation, contrary to the petition of the house of commons. He turned out the earl of Leicester, lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and sir William Parsons, one of the most active Protestant justices in that kingdom. He intercepted the parliamentary supplies in their way to Chester, and received a deputation from the Irish Catholics with greater ceremony and respect than from his Protestant subjects. Nor could his majesty be prevailed with to issue out a proclamation declaring the Irish, rebels, till the beginning of January, and even then only forty copies were printed, and not one to be dispersed till farther orders.‡ Indeed, the king proclaimed a monthly fast, and offered to raise an army of English for the relief of Ireland, which the commons declined; and instead thereof appointed a committee to treat for ten thousand Scots, which the house of lords, by direction from the king, put a stop to;§ so that between both, the relief of Ireland was neglected. The king would have persuaded the parliament to send over ten thousand English, that they might find it more difficult to raise forces in case of a breach with him; but the commons prevailed with the Scots to offer ten thousand of their nation, that they might not be obliged to leave themselves naked and defenceless in so critical a juncture.

Upon the whole it seems to me, that this barbarous insurrection and massacre was formed either here or in Ireland, to distress the parliament, after the failure of the design of doing it by the English army. The king seems to have been willingly ignorant ‖ of the progress of the affair, having in-

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 386, 387, folio.

† Ibid. p. [illegible], folio. Nelson, vol. 2. p. 400. 604.

‡ Rapin, vol. 2. p. 401, folio edition.

§ "The king (says Dr. Grey) was not concerned in it, as appears from Rapin, the author he (i. e. Mr. Neal) refers to." The doctor then relates, in Rapin's words, the three questions on this point, debated by the lords. In which statement there is, it is true, an entire silence about the king's interference. But the doctor had overlooked the preceding paragraph, which establishes Mr. Neal's assertion, in which Rapin says, "the king had found means to gain the peers [illegible]."

‖ "This (says bishop Warburton) is a villanous [illegible], destitute of all proof and likelihood." He [illegible] the warmth and bitterness. For if it be an accusation, it comes forward as a conclusion arising from the facts and

trusted the correspondence with the queen and her council; but when he heard how the Irish had overacted their part he was surprised, and thought it necessary to declare against them; yet when he came to his queen he appeared too favourable to their persons and conduct, and instead of going briskly into the measures that were proposed to subdue them, his majesty played the politician, and would have made use of the Irish rebellion to put himself at the head of an army to break up his English parliament.

While the king was in Scotland, it was given out by some ill-designing people, that since his majesty had yielded so much to the Scots, he might be persuaded to introduce presbytery into England at his return; upon which his majesty sent the following letter to Mr. Nichols, clerk of the council:

"I hear it is reported that at my return I intend to alter the government of the church of England, and to bring it to that form it is in here; therefore I command you to assure all my servants, that I will be constant to the discipline and doctrine of the church of England established by queen Elizabeth and my father; and that I resolve, by the grace of God, to die in the maintenance of it. Edinburgh, October 18, 1641."*

Accordingly his majesty resolved to fill up the vacant sees, and ordered five *congé d'élires* to be drawn for five clergymen therein named; but the two houses joining in a petition to his majesty to suspend his commands till he came home, the matter was delayed; however, soon after his return, he made the following removes and promotions.

Dr. Williams bishop of Lincoln, was translated to the province of York, in the room of Dr. Neile deceased, and Dr. Winniffe dean of St. Paul's, a grave and moderate divine, was made bishop of Lincoln; Dr. Duppa bishop of Chichester was translated to Salisbury, vacant by the death of Dr. Davenant; and Dr. King dean of Rochester was promoted to Chichester. Dr. Hall was translated from Exeter to Norwich, in the room of bishop Montague; and Dr. Brownrigge master of Catharine-hall, Cambridge, an eminent and learned divine, was advanced to Exeter. Dr. Skinner was trans-

authorities stated in the preceding pages. It is properly the opinion of the author, and the reader will judge how far it justly flows from the evidence laid before him. Ed.

* Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 603.

lated from Bristol to Oxford, vacant by the death of Dr. Bancroft; and Dr. Westfield archdeacon of St. Alban's, a very popular preacher, was promoted to Bristol; Dr. Prideaux, king's professor of divinity in Oxford, was made bishop of Worcester, in the room of bishop Thornborough deceased. The bishoprick of Carlisle being vacant by the death of Dr. Barnabas Potter a Puritan bishop, commonly called the penitential preacher, was given in *commendam* to the most reverend Dr. Usher archbishop and primate of Ireland, during the commotion in that kingdom. Most of these divines stood well in the opinion of the people, but their accepting bishopricks in this crisis did neither the king nor themselves any service. After this his majesty nominated but two bishops throughout the course of his reign; one was Dr. Frewen dean of Gloucester, and president of Magdalen-college, Oxon, to the bishoprick of Coventry and Litchfield, 1614, and Dr. Howel prebendary of Windsor to Bristol, about ten months after.

A committee had been appointed above a twelvemonth ago, at the motion of lord Digby, "to draw out of all the grievances of the nation such a remonstrance as might be a faithful and lively representation to his majesty, of the deplorable state of the kingdom;"* but it was laid aside till this time, when the prospect of an agreement between him and his parliament being almost at an end, after the breaking out of the Irish insurrection and massacre, it was perfected and read in the house of commons November 22, when it met with so strong an opposition, that it was carried only by nine voices,† after a long debate from three in the afternoon till three in the morning, which made one ‡ say, "it looked

* Bishop Warburton asks here, "Why are we told this but to mislead us? A year ago, before the king had made full satisfaction for his misgovernment, such a remonstrance was seasonable: now he had made full satisfaction, it was factious and seditious."—To this question of his lordship it may be retorted, Why should a design to mislead be insinuated against Mr. Neal? Has he not in the same paragraph informed his readers, that "many were of opinion, that those grievances which had been redressed ought to have been covered?" Doth he not fairly state the whole business? And doth he not, with candour and impartiality, avoid biassing his reader, while he waives giving a decided opinion on the conduct of the parliament in this affair? All this appears, in the hurry of his remarks, at breakfast time, to have escaped his lordship's notice. Had he read on before he wrote in the margin of his book, it would have precluded his censure.—Ed.

† This is a mistake copied from lord Clarendon. The numbers for passing the remonstrance were one hundred and fifty-nine, against it one hundred and forty-eight, so it was carried by eleven voices. Harris's Life of Oliver Cromwell, p. 74. Ed.

‡ Dr. Harris supposes this was sir Benjamin Rudyard, who, according to Willis, was in three parliaments, the representative of Portsmouth, and was afterward returned for Old Sarum once, for Downton once, and for Wilton twice. Ed.

like the verdict of a starved jury." Many were of opinion, that those grievances which had been redressed by the late acts of parliament ought to have been covered, lest the reviving them should make the breach wider between the king and parliament; while others thought the mentioning them could do no harm if it was done with respect, and that it was in a manner necessary in order to introduce the intended limitation of the royal power. However, this was the crisis that discovered the strength of the two parties, and was managed with such warmth, that Oliver Cromwell is said to tell lord Falkland, that "if the remonstrance had been rejected he would have sold all he had next morning and never have seen England more."

It is difficult to say which side of the question was right.* Mr. Rapin† will not take upon him to determine, whether it was necessary for the welfare of the kingdom, to put it out of the king's power to govern for the future in the same arbitrary manner as he had done for fifteen years; but he thinks the reason for it very plausible, and does not well see what security they could have who were for leaving the king in possession of the same power he had before enjoyed; especially if it be considered, that his majesty had still the same arbitrary principles, and the same inviolable attachment to his queen and the Popish faction, besides the current report that the court had fomented the Irish insurrection, which had filled the minds of the people with distracting terrors. It is certain the king had conceived an implacable aversion to the leading members of the Puritanical party in both houses, and having quieted the Scots, was determined to make them examples; of which they were not ignorant. After all, whether these and the like reasons were sufficient to justify the whole of the parliament's conduct in this affair, I will not presume to determine.

The remonstrance was presented to the king at Hampton-court [December 1, 1641] about a week after his majesty's return from Scotland, with a petition for redress of the grievances therein contained. It is easy to suppose it was not very acceptable, but the king gave the committee his hand to kiss, and took time to return an answer.‡ The remonstrance enumerates the several grievances, oppressions,

* Clarendon, vol. 2. p. 312.
† Rapin, vol. 2. p. 388. fol. edit.
‡ Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 456. Nalson's Collection, p. 691.

and unbounded acts of the prerogative, since his majesty's accession, to the number of almost two hundred, and charges their rise and progress, (1.) On the Jesuited Papists. (2.) On the court, bishops, and the corrupt part of the clergy. (3.) On such corrupt counsellors and courtiers as for private ends had engaged themselves in the interest of some foreign princes, to the prejudice of the king and state. These ministers are said to carry on their designs, (1.) By suppressing the power and purity of religion, and of such persons as were best affected to it. (2.) By cherishing the Arminian party in those points wherein they agree with the Papists, in order to widen the difference between the common Protestants and those called Puritans; and by introducing such opinions and ceremonies as tend to an accommodation with Popery. (3.) By fomenting differences and discontents between the king and his parliament, and by putting him upon arbitrary and illegal methods of raising supplies.

I omit the grievances of the state; those which related to the church were such as follow:

1. The suspensions, excommunications, deprivations, and degradations, of divers painful, learned, and pious ministers of the gospel, by the bishops; and the grievous oppression of great numbers of his majesty's faithful subjects.

2. The sharpness and severity of the high-commission, assisted by the council-table, not much less grievous than the Romish inquisition.

3. The rigour of the bishops' courts in the country, whereby great numbers of the meaner tradesmen have been impoverished and driven out of the kingdom to Holland and New England. The advancing those to ecclesiastical preferments who were most officious in promoting superstition, and most virulent in railing against godliness and honesty.

4. The design of reconciling the church of England with Rome, and imposing upon the church of Scotland such Popish superstitions and innovations, as might dispose them to join with England in the intended reconciliation.

5. The late canons and oath imposed upon the clergy under the severest penalties; and the continuance of the convocation by a new commission, after the dissolution of the parliament, wherein they raised taxes upon the subject for the maintenance of what was called "bellum episco-

pale." The rooting out of the kingdom by force, or driving away by fear, the Puritans; under which name they include all that desire to preserve the laws and liberties of the kingdom, and to maintain religion in the power of it.

6. The exempting Papists from penal laws, so far as amounted to a toleration, besides conferring upon them many other privileges and court-favours; these, say they, have had a secretary of state of their own religion, and a nuncio from the pope, by whose authority the Popish nobility, clergy, and gentry, have been convocated after the manner of a parliament; new jurisdictions have been erected of Popish archbishops; taxes have been levied; another state moulded within this state, independent in government, and secretly corrupting the ignorant professors of our religion, &c. The Papists have been furnished with arms and ammunition, listed in the king's service, and encouraged by the weekly prayers of their priests for the prosperity of their designs, to promote the Catholic cause. They complain farther of a party of bishops and Popish lords in the house of peers who have caused much opposition and delay in the prosecution of delinquents, and hindered the passing some good bills for the reforming abuses and corruptions in church and state; and of a malignant party that has countenanced the rebellion in Ireland.

After the recital of these grievances, they acknowledge with thankfulness the many acts that his majesty has passed this session for the public good, and put his majesty in mind of the large sums of money they had raised for his service, amounting to no less than a million and a half. They declare, "that it is far from their purpose or desire to let loose the golden reins of discipline and government in the church, to leave private persons or particular congregations to take up what form of divine service they please; for we hold it requisite (say they) that there should be throughout the whole realm a conformity to that order which the laws enjoin, according to the word of God; and we desire to unburden the consciences of men from needless and superstitious ceremonies, to suppress innovations, and to take away the monuments of idolatry. To effect this intended reformation, we desire there may be a general synod of the most grave, pious, learned, and judicious divines of this island, assisted with some from foreign parts professing the

same religion with us, who may consider of all things necessary for the peace and good government of the church, and represent the result of their consultations to the parliament, to be allowed and confirmed, and to receive the stamp of authority.—It is our chief care to advance and promote learning, and to provide a competent maintenance for conscionable and preaching ministers throughout the kingdom. —We intend likewise to reform and purge the fountains of learning—the two universities; that the streams flowing thence may be clear and pure, and an honour and comfort to the whole land. And seeing that the religion of Papists has such principles as certainly tend to the destruction and extirpation of all Protestants, when they have opportunity to effect it, it is necessary to keep them in such a condition, that they may not be able to do us any hurt."

In the petition that attended this remonstrance, after having assured his majesty, that they had not the least intention to lay any blemish upon his royal person by the foregoing declaration, but only to represent how his royal authority and trust had been abused, they humbly beseech his majesty to concur with his people in a parliamentary way, "(1.) For the depriving the bishops of their votes in parliament, and abridging their immoderate power, usurped over the clergy, and other your good subjects, to the hazard of religion, and prejudice of the just liberties of your people. (2.) For the taking away such oppressions in religion, church-government, and discipline, as have been brought in and fomented by them. (3.) For uniting all such your loyal subjects, as agree in fundamentals, against Papists, by removing some oppressions and unnecessary ceremonies, by which divers weak consciences have been offended, and seem to be divided from the rest." (4.) They conclude, "with beseeching his majesty to remove from his counsels, all favourers of Popery and arbitrary power, and promoters of the above-mentioned pressures and corruptions, and to employ such as his parliament might confide in; and that in his princely goodness he would reject all solicitations to the contrary, how powerful and near soever."*

His majesty in his answer to this petition, about a week after, complains very justly of the disrespect of the commons in printing their remonstrance before he had time to return

* Nelson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 692.

an answer. To the preamble and conclusion of the petition, he says, that "he knows of no wicked, arbitrary, and malignant party prevalent in the government, or near himself and his children;" and assures them, that the mediation of the nearest to him has always concurred in such persons, against whom there can be no just cause of exception. To the several articles his majesty replies; first, concerning religion, "that he is willing to concur with all the just desires of his people in a parliamentary way, for preserving the peace of the kingdom from the designs of the Popish party.

"That for depriving the bishops of their votes in parliament, he thought their right was grounded on the fundamental laws of the kingdom, and constitution of parliament, but since you desire our concurrence in a parliamentary way (says the king) we will give no farther answer at present.

"As for abridging the extraordinary power of the clergy, if there remain any excesses or usurpations in their jurisdictions, we neither have nor will protect them.

"Concerning church-corruptions, as you style them, and removing unnecessary ceremonies; we are willing to concur in the removal of any illegal innovations which may have crept in; and if our parliament advise us to call a national synod for that purpose, we shall take it into consideration.

"But we are very sorry to hear, in such general terms, corruption in religion objected, since we are persuaded in our own conscience, that no church can be found upon earth that professeth the true religion with more purity of doctrine than the church of England doth; nor where the government and discipline are jointly more beautified, and free from superstition, than as they are here established by law, which by the grace of God, we will with constancy maintain, while we live, in their purity and glory, not only against all invasions of Popery, but also from the irreverence of those many schismatics and separatists wherewith of late this kingdom and this city abound, to the great dishonour and hazard both of church and state; for the suppression of whom we require your timely aid and active assistance."

Some time after [December 15, 1641] his majesty pub-

lished his answer to the remonstrance,* with a declaration to all his loving subjects, in which he professes himself fully satisfied, "that the religion of the church of England is most agreeable to the word of God, and that he should be ready to seal with his blood, if God should call him to it. That as for ceremonies in religion, which are in their own nature indifferent, he is willing in tenderness to any number of his subjects, that a law should be made for the exemption of tender consciences from punishment, or prosecution for such ceremonies, as by the judgment of most men are held to be indifferent, and of some to be absolutely unlawful, provided the peace of the kingdom be not disturbed, nor the present decency and comeliness of God's service established in the church discountenanced; nor the pious, sober, and devout actions of those reverend persons, who were the first labourers in the blessed Reformation, be scandalized and defamed. His majesty then adds, that he cannot without grief of heart, and some tax upon himself and his ministers for not executing the laws, look upon the bold licence of some men, in printing pamphlets and sermons so full of bitterness and malice against the present government, and the law established, so full of sedition against himself and the peace of the kingdom, that he is many times amazed to consider by what eyes these things are seen, and by what ears they are heard; he therefore commands again all his officers and ministers of justice to proceed against them with all speed, and put the laws in execution."† Agreeably to this declaration his majesty issued out his royal proclamation December 10, requiring obedience to the laws and statutes ordained for the establishing true religion in this kingdom, and commanding that divine service be performed as heretofore; and that all officers and ministers, ecclesiastical and temporal, do put the said laws in due execution against all wilful contemners and disturbers of divine worship, contrary to the said laws and statutes.

Thus matters stood between the king and parliament, when all men expected the court-interest in the house of peers would be broken, by the issue of the impeachment of the thirteen bishops, for compiling the late canons, which was now approaching. The lords had resolved that such

* Nalson's Collection, vol. ii. p. 740, &c.
† Rushworth, part i. vol. i. p. 460.

bishops as were impeached, should not sit in the house when the merits of their cause was in debate, but that when the manner of proceeding was to be settled, they might be present but not vote. To enable them the better to make their defence, it was resolved farther that the bishop of Rochester with one other bishop, might have access twice to the archbishop of Canterbury in the Tower, to consult with him about their answer to the impeachment; and that all the lords-bishops may have access to and have copies of any acts and records in any of his majesty's courts of justice, that may serve for their defence. On the 10th of November the bishops put in their answer, consisting of a plea and demurrer, in which they neither confess nor deny the fact, but endeavour to shew that the offence of making canons could not amount to a premunire; which was certainly true, provided they had been made in a legal convocation, and that the canons themselves had not been contrary to the king's prerogative and the fundamental laws of the land. The answer was signed with all their hands except the bishop of Gloucester's, who pleaded not guilty *modo et forma*.* The commons were dissatisfied with the bishops, for not pleading directly to their charge; and with the lords, for receiving a demurrer when they were not present, contrary to the request which they sent up with the impeachment, especially when the nature of the case, being a mere matter of fact, could not require it; they therefore prayed the lords by serjeant Glyn to set aside the demurrer, and to admit them to make proof of their charge without any farther delay; or if they were satisfied with the charge, and the bishops would not plead to it, to proceed immediately to judgment; but the lords, instead of complying with the commons, gave the bishops their option, and ordered them to declare by Saturday, whether they would plead to the impeachment, or abide by their demurrer, when they declared they would abide by their demurrer; upon which the lords appointed Monday following [December 11] to hear them by their counsel in presence of the commons; but the house resenting this dilatory method of proceeding in a case which they allege was so apparent and manifest to the whole world, would not appear; the most active members declaring among their friends with a sort of despair, that they would be concerned no far-

* Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 715. 721.

ther against the bishops, for they now saw it was in vain to attack a number of men whom the court and the house of lords were resolved to protect.

When this was rumoured in the city it alarmed the people, whose fears were already sufficiently awakened with the apprehensions of a Popish massacre and insurrection within their own walls. The aldermen and common-council immediately assembled, and drew up a petition to support the courage of the commons, and went with it to Westminster in sixty coaches, attended by a great number of the lower people.* The petition prays, "that the house of commons would still be a means to the king and the house of peers, to concur with them [the commons] in redressing the grievances of church and state, and for the better effecting hereof, that the Popish lords and bishops may be removed out of the house of peers." The speaker returned them thanks in the name of the house, and promised to take their address into consideration in due time. A few days after great numbers of the people assembled at Blackheath, to sign a petition to the same purpose; and within a fortnight the apprentices of London went up with a petition signed with a multitude of names, complaining of the decay of trade, occasioned by Papists and prelates, and by a malignant party that adhered to them; and praying, that the Popish lords, and other eminent persons of that religion, might be secured, and that prelacy might be rooted out, according to their former petition, commonly called the root and branch. The commons received their petition favourably; but the king, instead of calming the citizens, increased their jealousies and suspicions, by removing at this very time sir William Belfour from the lieutenancy of the Tower, and putting colonel Lunsford into his place, a suspected Papist, of no fortune, who had been once outlawed, and was fit for any desperate attempt; this unseasonable promotion occasioned petitions to his majesty for his removal, which with much difficulty, after some time, was obtained, but the jealousies of the people still remained.

The petitions above mentioned against the bishops were confronted with others out of the country, in their favour. November 18, the humble petition of the knights, esquires,

* Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 733.

gentlemen, parsons,* vicars, curates, &c. of Rutlandshire, was presented to the house, signed by about eight hundred and forty hands, praying for the continuance of episcopacy, as the only government of apostolical institution sealed with the blood of martyrs, admirably suited to the civil government of this kingdom, and affirming, that no presbyter ever laid on hands without a bishop. December 8, a petition of the like nature was presented from Huntingdonshire, and two days after another from Somersetshire, signed with above fourteen thousand names.†‡

On the other hand, the ministers appointed to solicit their remonstrance formerly mentioned, addressed the house, December 20, 1641, acknowledging "their piety and zeal for the true religion, against Popery and superstition; in countenancing the sacred ordinance of preaching; in encouraging painful and godly ministers, formerly set aside, but now profitably employed in many congregations; in discountenancing of bold intruders, who, without a sufficient call, have thrust themselves into the sacred office; as also, of all unworthy and scandalous ministers; in freeing divers godly ministers from prison and exile, and others from heavy censures; in preventing the utter ruin of the petitioners, by setting aside the late oath and canons, the high-commission, and other illegal pressures of ecclesiastical courts; in making an order to take away all superstitious rites and ceremonies, images, pictures, and other innovations, out of churches; in conducting the late peace with Scotland to a happy conclusion, and in their vigorous endeavours for the relief of Ireland, &c. But whereas there still remain a great many grievances to be removed, they are necessitated to renew their former suit for redress of the aforesaid evils, and for taking away whatever shall appear to be the root and

* "And householders in the county of Rutland, in behalf of themselves and families:" omitted. Dr. Grey.

† There were also petitions from the counties of Cheshire, Nottingham, Devonshire, Stafford, Kent, the six shires of North Wales, the counties of Lancaster, Cornwall, and Hereford. Of these petitions, that from Devon had eight thousand signatures; that from Stafford three thousand; and those from the six shires of North Wales thirty thousand. Amongst the petitioners were computed, where the different ranks of the petitioners were classed, to be five peers, two hundred and twenty-five knights, three hundred and ninety-nine divines, one thousand five hundred and eighty-eight gentlemen, and twenty-eight thousand three hundred and thirty-six freeholders. Dr. Grey's Examination, vol. 1. p. 312. 314.

‡ Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 726, 727.

cause of them. And whereas the petitioners, and many others, are desirous in all things to submit to the laws, so far as possibly they may, yet merely out of tenderness and scruple of conscience, they dare not continue, as formerly they did, the exercise of some things enjoined; not only because they have more seriously weighed the nature and scandal of them, and because sundry bishops, and other grave divines, called to their assistance by order of the house of peers, have, as they are informed, discovered divers particulars which need alteration in the liturgy; and because there is not, as they humbly conceive, at this day, commonly extant, any book of common prayer without so many alterations and additions, as render it in many parts another thing from that which is by law established; but chiefly, because the house, from a sense of its defects, has taken the reformation thereof under consideration, which they hoped would be some shelter against the strict pressing the use of it, till their pleasure was declared in a parliamentary way. But though the petitioners have been comfortably assured of some ease herein, yet now to their great sorrow they apprehend that the same things are anew enforced, which may occasion much trouble and vexation to sundry peaceable and worthy ministers, some of whom have been indicted upon the statute of 1 Eliz. cap. 2, since the beginning of this present parliament, and others threatened for omissions of some things complained of to this high court and still depending before you. The petitioners therefore pray the house to resume the consideration of their former petition, and to commit the same to the debate of a free synod, and in the meantime to be mediators to his majesty for some relaxation in matters of ceremony, and of reading the whole liturgy. They farther pray, that a monthly fast may be appointed and religiously observed, during the present sessions of parliament, and they will be ready at any time to offer reasons why there should be a synod of a different constitution from the convocation now in being, when they shall be required."*

The carrying up these petitions to Westminster, and especially that of the London apprentices, occasioned great tumults about the parliament-house. The king was at his palace at Whitehall, attended by a great number of dis-

* [illegible]

banded officers, whom his majesty received with great ceremony, and employed as a guard to his royal person. These officers insulted the common people, and gave them ill language as they passed by the court to the parliament-house, crying out, No bishops, no Popish lords! If the people ventured to reply, the officers followed their reproaches with cuts and lashes, which, says lord Clarendon,* produced some wounds, and drew blood. Mr. Baxter says, they came out of Whitehall, and catched some of them, and cut off their ears. From these skirmishes, and from the shortness of the apprentices' hair, which was cut close about their ears, the two parties began first to be distinguished by the names of Roundhead and Cavalier. David Hyde, one of the reformades, first drew his sword in Palace-yard, and swore he would cut the throats of those round-headed dogs that bawled against the bishops. Dr. Williams, bishop of Lincoln, lately promoted to the see of York, going by land to the house of peers in company with the earl of Dover, and hearing a youth cry out louder than the rest, No bishops, no Popish lords! stepped from the earl and laid hands on him, but his companions rescued him, and about a hundred of them surrounded the bishop, hemmed him in, and with a universal shout cried out, No bishops! after which they opened a passage and let his grace go forward to the house.† The same day colonel Lunsford coming through Westminster-hall in company with thirty or forty officers, drew his sword and wounded about twenty apprentices and citizens: others walking in the abbey while their friends were waiting for an answer to their petition, were ordered by the vergers to clear the church, lest the ornaments of the cathedral should suffer damage; upon which most of them went out, and the doors were shut, but some few remaining behind, were apprehended and carried before the bishop, which occasioned another skirmish, in which sir Richard Wiseman was killed by a stone from the battlements; after which the officers and soldiers sallied out upon the mob with sword in hand, and obliged them to retire. The news of this being reported in the city, the whole populace was in arms, and resolved to go next morning to Westminster with swords and staves. The lord-mayor and sheriffs raised the train-bands, and having ordered the city-gates to be kept

* Vol. 1. p. 339.

† Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 464.

shut, they rode about all night to keep the peace; but it was impossible to hinder the people's going out in the day. On the other hand, the king commanded the militia of Westminster and Middlesex to be raised by turns, as a guard to his royal person and family; upon which several gentlemen of the inns of court offered their service, in case his majesty apprehended any danger.* The house of commons being no less afraid of themselves, petitioned for a guard out of the city of London, under the command of the earl of Essex, which his majesty refused, but told them, he would take as much care of them as of his own children; and if this would not suffice, he would command such a guard to wait upon them as he would be answerable to God for; but the house not being willing to trust to the king's guard, declined his majesty's offer, and not prevailing for one of their own choosing, they ordered halberds to be brought into the house, and resolved, in case of an assault, to defend themselves.

The lords exerted themselves to disperse the tumults, by sending their gentleman-usher of the black rod to command the people to depart to their homes; and by appointing a committee to inquire into the causes of them. His majesty also published a proclamation [December 28, 1641] forbidding all tumultuous assemblies of the people. But the commons being unwilling to affront the citizens, were not so vigorous in suppressing them, as it is thought the circumstances of things required; for as the king relied upon his guard of officers, the commons had their dependance upon the good-will of the citizens. Not that the house can be charged with encouraging tumults,† for the very next

* Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 456. 471.

† Bishop Warburton is very warm on this assertion, and calls it "a notorious falsehood." The house, he says, "has been charged by all mankind with encouraging the tumults, though not with publicly avowing that they did encourage them." The truth or falsehood of Mr. Neal's assertion will depend on the explanation of the word "encourage;" if it means connivance at, and giving countenance to, the tumults, its veracity may be impeached. For when the lords desired, on December 27, the house to join in publishing a declaration against the tumults, and in petitioning the king for a guard, they waived taking the request into consideration, on the plea, that the hour was too late for it. When the next day came, they adjourned the matter to the succeeding. The mob being again assembled on the 29th, they sent their message to the lords. Mr. Neal does not immediately state these circumstances, but he represents the commons as not acting with vigour in suppressing the riots, and as placing some dependance on the spirit which the people showed. Mr. Neal therefore by encoura-

day after the king's proclamation they sent a message to the lords, declaring their readiness to concur in all lawful methods to appease them; but being sensible their strength was among the inhabitants of London, without whose countenance and support every thing must have been given back into the hands of the court, they were tender of entering upon vigorous measures.

While these tumults continued the bishops were advised to forbear their attendance upon the house, at least till after the recess at Christmas; but this looking too much like cowardice, their lordships determined to do their duty; and because the streets were crowded with unruly people, they agreed to go by water in their barges; but as soon as they came near the shore, the mob saluted them with a volley of stones, so that being afraid to land, they rowed back and returned to their own houses. Upon this repulse, twelve of them met privately at the archbishop of York's lodgings in Westminster, to consult what measures were to be taken. The archbishop advised them to go no more to the house, and immediately in a heat drew up the following protestation against whatsoever the two houses should do in their absence, which all present signed with their hands, except the bishop of Winchester.

"To the king's most excellent majesty, and the lords and peers now assembled in parliament.

"The humble petition and protestation of all the bishops and prelates now called by his majesty's writs to attend the parliament, and present about London and Westminster for that service.

"Whereas the petitioners are called up by several and respective writs and under great penalties to attend the parliament, and have a clear and indubitable right to vote in bills, and other matters whatsoever debatable in parlia-

ging the tumults, must be understood to mean, as Rapin expresses it, "taking any resolution to encourage these tumults," or avowing an approbation of them: then his assertion is, in the judgment of even bishop Warburton, just and true. The reader cannot but observe, that Mr. Neal thought that the tumults were not, at first at least, disagreeable to the commons. Yet it should be observed, that Whitelocke, speaking of them, says, "it was a dismal thing to all sober men, especially members of parliament, to see and hear them." Memorials, p. 51.—Ed.

ment, by the ancient customs, laws, and statutes, of this realm, and ought to be protected by your majesty quietly to attend and prosecute that great service: they humbly remonstrate and protest before God, your majesty, and the noble lords and peers now assembled in parliament, that as they have an indubitate right to sit and vote in the house of lords, so are they, if they may be protected from force and violence, most ready and willing to perform their duties accordingly. And that they do abominate all actions or opinions tending to Popery and the maintenance thereof; as also, all propension and inclination to any malignant party, or any other side or party whatsoever, to the which their own reasons and conscience shall not move them to adhere. But whereas they have been at several times violently menaced, affronted, and assaulted, by multitudes of people in their coming to perform their services in that honourable house, and lately chased away and put in danger of their lives, and can find no redress or protection, upon sundry complaints made to both houses in these particulars: they humbly protest before your majesty, and the noble house of peers, that saving unto themselves all their rights and interest of sitting and voting in that house at other times, they dare not sit or vote in the house of peers, until your majesty shall farther secure them from all affronts, indignities, and dangers, in the premises. Lastly, whereas their fears are not built upon fantasies and conceits, but upon such grounds and objections as may well terrify men of resolution and much constancy, they do, in all humility and duty, protest before your majesty, and the peers of that most honourable house of parliament, against all laws, orders, votes, resolutions, and determinations, as in themselves null, and of none effect, which in their absence, since the 27th of this month of December 1641, have already passed; as likewise, against all such as shall hereafter pass in that most honourable house, during the time of this their forced and violent absence from the said most honourable house; not denying, but if their absenting of themselves were wilful and voluntary, that most honourable house might proceed in all the premises, their absence, or this protestation, notwithstanding. And humbly beseeching your most excellent majesty to command the clerk of that house of

peers, to enter this their petition and protestation among their records,

"And they will ever pray God to bless, &c.

"John Eborac.	George Hereford,
Tho. Duresme,	Rob. Oxon,
Ro. Cov. Lichf.	Mat. Ely,
Jos. Norwich,	Godfrey Gloucester,
Jo. Asaph,	Jo. Peterborough,
Gul. Bath and Wells,	Morice Landaff."

This protestation was presented to the king by archbishop Williams,* who undertook to justify the lawfulness of it; but his majesty declining to appear in so nice an affair, delivered it into the hands of the lord-keeper Littleton, who by his majesty's command read it in the house of lords the next morning. After some debate the lords desired a conference with the commons, when the keeper in the name of the house of peers declared, that "the protestation of the bishops contained matters of high and dangerous consequence, extending to the intrenching upon the fundamental privileges and being of parliaments, and therefore the lords thought fit to communicate it to the commons."† The protestation being communicated to the house of commons, they resolved, within half an hour, to accuse the twelve bishops of high treason, "for endeavouring to subvert the fundamental laws and being of parliaments," and sent up their impeachment by Mr. Glyn, who having delivered it at the bar of the house of lords, the usher of the black rod was ordered to go immediately in search of the bishops, and bring them to the house; the bishops appearing the same evening [December 30] were sequestered from parliament, ten of them being sent to the Tower, the bishops of Durham and Norwich,‡ by reason of their great age and the service they had done the church of God by their writing and preaching, being committed to the custody of the black rod, with an allowance of 5*l.* a day for their expenses.§

The adversaries of the bishops in both houses were extremely pleased with their unadvised conduct; one said, it was the finger of God, to bring that to pass which otherwise

* Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 351.
† Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 467.
‡ Morton and Hall.
§ Fuller, b. 11. p. 160.

could not have been compassed. There was but one gentleman in the whole debate that spoke in their behalf, and he said, "he did not believe they were guilty of high treason, but that they were stark mad, and therefore desired they may be sent to Bedlam." Lord Clarendon* censures this protestation, as proceeding from the pride and passion of archbishop Williams; he admits that the eleven bishops were ill advised, in going into his measures, and suffering themselves to be precipitated into so hasty a resolution, though he is certain there could be nothing of high treason in it. However, their behaviour gave such scandal and offence, even to those who passionately desired to preserve their function, that they had no compassion or regard for their persons.

The objections that I have met with against the protestation, are these; First, That it tended to destroy the very being of parliaments, because it put a stop to all laws, orders, votes, and resolutions, made in the absence of the bishops. Secondly, The presence of the bishops is hereby made so essential that no act can pass without them, which is claiming a negative voice, like the kings. Thirdly, The bishops desiring the king to command the clerk of the house of peers to enter their protestation on record, was derogatory to the rights of parliament, as though the king by his command could make a record of parliament. Fourthly, The annulling all laws that might be made at this time, when Ireland was in so much danger from the breaking out of the Irish massacre, was a sort of conspiring with the rebels to destroy that kingdom. Fifthly, It was said, that besides the unwarrantable expressions in the protestation, the form of presenting and transmitting it was unjustifiable.

On the other hand it was said on behalf of the bishops, that here was a manifest force put upon them; and a violence offered to the freedom of one member of parliament, is a violence offered to the whole; that therefore they had a right to protest, and guard their privileges, without being accountable for the ill consequences that might follow. Yet surely this manner of asserting their privilege was irregular; should they not have petitioned the lords to secure their passage to parliament, rather than have put a negative upon all their proceedings? I have met with only one

* Vol. 1. p. 109.

learned writer who commends the bishops upon this occasion, and he advances them, in romantic language, to the rank of heroes; his words are these; "Had the bishops done less, they had fallen short of that fortitude which might justly be expected from them. They had reason to conclude the root and branch work would certainly go forward, and therefore to be silent under such an outrage would look like cowardice. When the prospect is thus menacing, and a man is almost certain to be undone, the most creditable expedient is to spend himself in a blaze, and flash to the last grain of powder. To go out in a smoke and smother is but a mean way of coming to nothing. To creep and crawl to a misfortune is to suffer like an insect. A man ought to fall with dignity and honour, and to keep his mind erect though his fortune happens to be crushed. This was the bishops' meaning, and for making so handsome a retreat they ought to stand commended upon record."* But with due regard to this reverend divine, was there no medium between being silent, and taking upon them in such a crisis to stop all the business of parliament? For if the proceedings of the house of peers are null without the bishops, it is no less certain, that those of the house of commons are null without the peers; from whence it must follow, that the whole parliament was incapable of acting. Mr. Rapin† is of opinion, that the king hoped "that this affair might occasion the dissolution of the parliament." But if he did, his majesty was much mistaken, for the bishops and Popish lords being now absent, the majority of the whole house of peers was against the court; which vexed the queen and her faction, and put them upon such an extravagant piece of revenge as effectually broke the peace of the kingdom, and rendered the king's affairs irretrievable.

His majesty having been assured that the lord Kimbolton, and five of the most active members in the house of commons, viz. Denzil Hollis, sir Arthur Hasterigge, John Pym, John Hampden, and William Stroud, esqrs. had invited the Scots into England, and were now the chief encouragers of those tumults that had kept the bishops and Popish lords from the house; that they had aspersed his government, and were endeavouring to deprive him of his royal power; in a word, that they were conspiring to levy war against him, resolved

* Collyer's Eccles. Hist. vol. 2. p. 819. † Vol. 1. p. 405, folio

to impeach them of high treason; accordingly his majesty sent his attorney-general to the house with the articles [January 3, 1641], and at the same time dispatched officers to their houses to seal up their trunks, papers, and doors; but the members not being ordered into custody, as his majesty expected, the king went himself to the house next day in the afternoon [January 4] to seize them, attended with about two hundred officers and soldiers, armed with swords and pistols; the gentlemen of the inns of court, who had offered their service to defend the king's person, having had notice to be ready at an hour's warning.* The king having entered the house, went directly to the speaker's chair, and looking about him, said with a frown, "I perceive the birds are fled, but I will have them wheresoever I can find them, for as long as these persons are here, this house will never be in the right way that I heartily wish it; I expect therefore, that as soon as they come to the house, that you send them to me." Having then assured the members, that he designed no force upon them, nor breach of privilege, after a little time he withdrew; but as his majesty was going out, many members cried aloud, so as he might hear them, Privilege! privilege!† The house was in a terrible panic while the king was in the chair, the door of the house, with all the avenues, being crowded with officers and soldiers: as soon therefore as his majesty was gone they adjourned till the next day, and then for a week. It was happy that the five members had notice of the king's coming, just time enough to withdraw into the city, otherwise it might have occasioned the effusion of blood, for without doubt the armed soldiers at the door waited only for the word to carry them away by force. Next day his majesty went into the city [January 5] and demanded them of the lord-mayor and court of aldermen, then assembled by his order at Guildhall, professing at the same time his resolution to prosecute all who opposed the laws, whether Papists or separatists, and to defend the true Protestant religion which his father professed, and in which he would continue to the end of his life.‡ But though his majesty was nobly entertained by the sheriffs, he now perceived, that this rash and unadvised action had lost him the hearts of the citizens, there being no acclama-

* Whitelocke's Memorials, p. 50.
† Ibid. p. 51.
‡ Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 479.

tions or *huzzas*, as usual, only here and there a voice, as he went along in his coach, crying out, Privilege of parliament! privilege of parliament! However, he persisted in his resolution, and January 8 published a proclamation, commanding all magistrates, and officers of justice, to apprehend the accused members and carry them to the Tower.

It is hard to say with any certainty, who put the king upon this unparalleled act of violence, a species of tyranny which the most arbitrary of his predecessors had never attempted. If his majesty deliberated at all upon what he was going about, we must conclude, that he intended to dissolve the parliament, and to return to his former methods of arbitrary government; because by the same rule that the king might take five members out of the house he might take out five hundred; besides, several of the articles laid against them were equally chargeable on the majority of the house. It now appeared, says Rapin,* that the king was resolved to be revenged on those that had offended him; and that there was no farther room to confide in his royal word. Some say that this was lord Digby's mad project, who, when he found his majesty, after his return out of the city, vexed at his disappointment, offered to go with a select company and bring them dead or alive; but the king was afraid of the consequences of such an enterprise; and Digby being ordered to attend in his place in the house, thought fit to withdraw out of the kingdom. Mr. Echard,† with greater probability, lays it upon the queen and her cabal of Papists; and adds, that when the king expressed his distrust of the affair, her majesty broke out into a violent passion, and said, "Allez, poltron," &c. "Go, coward, and pull those rogues out by the ears, or never see my face

* Vol. 2. p. 408, 409, folio edition.

† Bishop Warburton is much displeased with Mr. Neal for quoting the authority, and giving in to the opinion, of Echard. For he says, "It was a known and uncontroverted fact, that the advice was Digby's." To invalidate the supposition, that the measure proceeded from the queen's counsels, his lordship urges, that the queen was not capable of any vigorous steps, being intimidated with the fear of an impeachment, and actually projecting her escape: as if danger and alarm were incompatible with concerting and adopting the means of avoiding the threatening evil; as if Digby might not be the ostensible adviser of measures, which others suggested and instigated. That he was the sole author of this measure, is not so uncontroverted a fact as the bishop conceived it to be: and it may be alleged in favour of Mr Neal and Echard, that amongst the divers excuses made for this action, some imputed it to the irritation and counsel of the women; telling the king, "that if he were king of England he would not suffer himself to be baffled about such persons." The notice of this intended step was given to these five gentlemen by a great court lady, their friend; who overheard some discourse about it. Whitelocke's Memorial, p. 50, 51.—Ed.

any more;" which it seems, says the archdeacon, determined the whole matter.

The citizens of London were so far from delivering up the five members, that they petitioned the king that they might be at liberty, and proceeded against according to the methods of parliament. At the same time they acquainted his majesty with their apprehensions of the ruin of trade, and of the danger of the Protestant religion, by reason of the progress of the rebellion in Ireland, and the number of Papists and other disbanded officers about the court. His majesty, finding he had lost the city, fortified Whitehall with men and ammunition, and sent cannoniers into the Tower to defend it, if there should be occasion.* When the citizens complained of this, his majesty replied, "that it was done with an eye to their safety and advantage; that his fortifying Whitehall was not before it was necessary, and that if any citizens had been wounded, it was undoubtedly for their evil and corrupt demeanour." But they had no confidence in the king's protection. A thousand mariners and sailors offered to guard the five members to Westminster by water upon the day of their adjournment [January 11], and the train-bands offered the committee at Guildhall to do the same by land, which was accepted; and the offer of the apprentices refused. Things being come to this extremity, his majesty, to avoid the hazard of an affront from the populace, took a fatal resolution to leave Whitehall, and accordingly, January 10, the day before the parliament was to meet, he removed with his queen and the whole royal family to Hampton-court, and two days after to Windsor, from whence he travelled by easy stages to York; never returning to London till he was brought thither as a criminal to execution.

By the king's deserting his capital in this manner, and not returning when the ferment was over, he left the strength and riches of the kingdom in the hands of his parliament; for next day the five members were conducted by water in triumph to Westminster, the train-bands of the city marching at the same time by land, who, after they had received the thanks of the house, were dismissed; and serjeant Skippon, with a company of the city-militia, was appointed to guard the parliament-house; "from this day (says lord

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 408, folio edition.

Clarendon*) we may reasonably date the levying war in England, whatsoever has been since done being but the superstructures upon these foundations." It must be considered that two days after [January 12] the king sent a message to the house, waiving his proceedings with respect to the five members, and promising to be as careful of their privileges as of his life or crown; and a little after offered a general pardon; but the commons had too much reason at this time not to depend upon his royal promise; they insisted that the accused members should be brought to their trial in a legal and parliamentary way; in order to which they desired his majesty to inform them, what proof there was against them; it being the undoubted right and privilege of parliament, that no member can be proceeded against without the consent of the house; which his majesty, refusing to comply with, removed farther off to Windsor, and entered upon measures very inconsistent with the peace of the kingdom.†

To return to the bishops: About a fortnight after their commitment [January 17, 1742] they pleaded to the impeachment of the house of commons, "Not guilty in manner and form," and petitioned the lords for a speedy trial, which was appointed for the 25th instant, but was put off from time to time, till the whole bench of bishops was voted out of the house, and then entirely dropped; for the very next day after their commitment, the commons desired the lords to resume the consideration of the bill that had been sent up some months ago, for taking away all temporal jurisdiction from those in holy orders, which the lords promised: it had passed the commons without any difficulty, about the time of the Irish insurrection, and was laid aside in the house of lords, as being thought impossible to pass while the bishops' votes were entire: when it was revived at this juncture, the earl of Bedford and the bishop of Rochester made a vigorous stand against it.‡ His lordship urged, that it was contrary to the usage of parliament when a bill had been once rejected to bring it in a second time the same session. To which it was replied, that it was not the same bill [having a new title], though it was to accomplish the same end. Besides, the distress of the times required some extraordi-

* Vol. 1. p. 383. † Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 492.
‡ Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 302. 416.

nary measures for their redress; and farther, since the king had been graciously pleased to pass an act for the continuance of this parliament as long as they thought fit to sit, and thereby parted with his right of proroguing or dissolving them, the nature of things was altered, and therefore they were not to be tied down to the ordinary forms in other cases. The question being put, whether the bill should be read, it passed in the affirmative; upon which the consideration of it was resumed, and after some few debates the bill was passed by a very great majority, February 6, 1641—2; the citizens of London expressing their satisfaction by ringing of bells and bonfires. But it was still apprehended that the king would refuse his assent, because when he had been pressed to it his majesty had said, it was a matter of great concernment, and therefore he would take time to consider; however, the commons, not content with this delay, sent again to Windsor, to press his compliance upon the following reasons: "Because the subjects suffered by the bishops exercising temporal jurisdiction, and making a party in the house of lords; because it was apprehended that there would be a happy conjunction of both houses upon the exclusion of the bishops; and the signing this bill would be a comfortable pledge of his majesty's gracious assent to the future remedies of those evils which were to be presented to him."*

This message from the house of commons was seconded by those of greatest trust about the king, who argued, "that the combination against the bishops was irresistible; that the passing this bill was the only way to preserve the church; and that if the parliament was gratified in this, so many persons in both houses would be fully satisfied that they would join in no farther alterations; but if they were crossed in this, they would endeavour an extirpation of the bishops and a demolishing of the whole fabric of the church." They argued farther, "that force or indirect means having been made use of to obtain the bill, the king might by his power bring the bishops in again when the present distempers were composed." An argument by which his majesty might have set aside all his concessions, or acts of grace (as he pleased to call them), to his parliament at once. But none of these reasons would have prevailed, had not the queen

* Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 117.

made use of her sovereign influence over the king. Her majesty was made to believe by sir J. Culpeper, that her own preservation depended upon the king's consent to the bill; that if his majesty refused it, her journey into Holland would be stopped, and her person possibly endangered by some mutiny or insurrection; whereas the using her interest with the king, would lay a popular obligation upon the kingdom, and make her acceptable to the parliament. These arguments carrying a face of probability, her majesty wrested the king's resolution from him, so that the bill was signed by commission, February 14, together with another against pressing soldiers, his majesty being then at Canterbury, accompanying the queen in her passage to Holland. But his majesty's signing them with so much reluctance did him a disservice.* All men took notice of his discontent; and lord Clarendon says,† he has cause to believe that the king was prevailed with to sign them, "because he was told, that there being violence and force used to obtain them, they were therefore in themselves null, and in quieter times might easily be revoked and disannulled." A dangerous doctrine, as it may tend to overthrow the most established laws of a country! To give the reader the act itself:

"Whereas bishops and other persons in holy orders, ought not to be entangled with secular jurisdiction, the office of the ministry being of such great importance that it will take up the whole man. And for that it is found by long experience, that their intermeddling with secular jurisdictions hath occasioned great mischiefs and scandals both to church and state, his majesty, out of his religious care of the church and souls of his people, is graciously pleased that it be enacted, and by authority of this present parliament be it enacted, that no archbishop or bishop, or other person that now is or hereafter shall be in holy orders, shall at any time after the 15th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1641, have any seat or place, suffrage or vote, or use or execute any power or authority, in the parliaments of this realm, nor shall be of the privy-council of his majesty, his heirs or successors, or justices of the peace of oyer and terminer or jail-delivery, or execute any temporal authority, by virtue of any commission; but shall be wholly disabled, and be incapable to have, receive, use, or execute,

* Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 552. † Vol. 1. p. 429, 430.

any of the said offices, places, powers, authorities, and things aforesaid.

"And be it farther enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all acts from and after the said 15th of February, which shall be done or executed by any archbishop or bishop, or other person whatsoever in holy orders; and all and every suffrage or voice given or delivered by them or any of them, or other thing done by them or any of them, contrary to the purport and true meaning of this act, shall be utterly void to all intents, constructions, and purposes."

Thus the peerage of the bishops and the whole secular power of the clergy, ceased for about twenty years; how far they contributed to it by their pride and ambition, their sovereign contempt of the laity, and indiscreet behaviour towards their Protestant brethren, has been already observed. Their enemies said the hand of God was against them, because they had given too much countenance to the ridiculing of true devotion and piety, under the name of godly Puritanism;* because they had silenced great numbers of ministers eminent for learning and religion, for not complying with certain indifferent rites and ceremonies, while others who were vicious and insufficient for their office, were encouraged; because they made a stricter inquiry after those who fasted and prayed, and joined together in religious exercises, than after those who were guilty of swearing, drunkenness, and other kinds of debauchery; because they discouraged afternoon sermons and lectures, and encouraged sports and pastimes on the Lord's day; because they had driven many hundred families out of the land; and were, upon the whole, enemies to the civil interests of their country. Others observed, that most of them verged too much towards the see of Rome, and gave ground to suspect that they were designing a union between the two churches, which at a time when the Roman Catholics in Ireland had imbrued their hands in the blood of almost two hundred thousand Protestants, and were so numerous at home as to make large and public collections of money to support the king in his war against the Scots, was sufficient to make every sincere Protestant jealous of their power. Besides, the bishops themselves had been guilty of many oppressions;

* Baxter's History, Life, and Times, p. 33.

they had in a manner laid aside the practice of preaching, that they might be the more at leisure for the governing part of their function; though even here they devolved the whole of their jurisdiction upon their chancellors and under officers.* They did not sit in their consistories to hear complaints, or do justice either to clergy or laity, but turned over the people to registrars, proctors, and apparitors, who drew their money from them against equity and law, and used them at discretion. Few or none of them made their visitations in person, or lived in their episcopal cities; by which means there was no kind of hospitality or liberality to the poor. Divine service in the cathedrals was neglected or ill performed, for want of their presence and inspection. Instead of conferring orders at the mother-church, they made use of the chapels of their private houses, without requiring the assistance of their deans and chapters upon such solemn occasions; they pronounced the censures of deprivation and degradation in a monarchial and absolute manner, not calling in the deans and chapters to any share of the administration. And upon the whole, they did little else but receive their rents, indulge their ease, consult their grandeur, and lord it over their brethren. These were the popular complaints against them, which made the citizens rejoice at their downfal, and attend the passing the bill with bonfires and illuminations. However, if all these things had not concurred in a nice and critical juncture of affairs, the attempts of the house of commons would have been in vain; neither the king nor peers being heartily willing to deprive them of their seats in parliament. This was one of the last bills the king passed; and the only law which he enacted in prejudice of the established church.† Here his majesty made a stand, and by a message sent to both houses, desired not to be pressed to any one single act farther, till the whole affair of church government and the liturgy was so digested and settled, that he might see clearly what was fit to remain, as well as what was fit to be taken away.

* Collyer's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2. p. 820.
† Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 561.

CHAP. XI.

FROM THE KING'S LEAVING WHITEHALL TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE CIVIL WAR.

ALL things now tended to a rupture between the king and parliament; the legislature being divided and the constitution broken. While the royal family was at Hampton-court, the officers and soldiers who were quartered about Kingston, to the number of two hundred, made such disturbances, that the militia of the county was raised to disperse them. After a few days the king removed to Windsor, where a cabinet-council was held in presence of the queen, in which, besides the resolution of passing no more bills, already mentioned, it was farther agreed, that her majesty being to accompany the princess her daughter to Holland, in order to her marriage with the prince of Orange, should take with her the crown-jewels, and pledge them for ready money; with which she should purchase arms and ammunition, &c. for the king's service. She was also to treat with the kings of France and Spain for four thousand soldiers, by the mediation of the pope's nuncio. It was farther resolved, that his majesty should come to no agreement with the parliament, till he understood the success of her negotiations, but should endeavour to get possession of the important fortresses of Portsmouth and Hull, where the arms and artillery of the late army in the north were deposited. Mr. Echard says it was resolved, that the queen should remove to Portsmouth, and the king to Hull; that being possessed of those places of strength, where his friends might resort to him with safety, he should sit still till the hot spirits at Westminster could be brought to reason;* but this important secret being discovered, the parliament entered upon more effectual measures for their safety: they sent to Col. Goring, governor of Portsmouth, not to receive any forces into the town but by authority of the king, signified by both houses of parliament. Sir John Hotham was sent to secure the magazine at Hull; and a guard was placed about the Tower of London, to prevent

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 485. folio edition.

the carrying out any ordnance or ammunition without consent of parliament. Lord Clarendon, and after him Mr. Echard, censure the two houses for exercising these first acts of sovereignty; how far they were necessary for their own and the public safety, after what had passed, and the resolutions of the councils at Windsor, I leave with the reader.

The command of the militia had been usually in the crown; though the law had not positively determined in whom that great power was lodged, as Mr. Whitelocke undertook to prove before the commissioners at Uxbridge;* the king claimed the sole disposal of it, whereas the parliament insisted that it was not in the king alone, but in the king and parliament jointly; and that when the kingdom is in imminent danger, if the royal power be not exerted in its defence, the military force may be raised without it. But waiving the question of right, the parliament desired the command of the militia might be put into such hands as they could confide in only for two years, till the present disorders were quieted. This the king refused, unless the house would first give up the question of right, and vest the sole command of the militia in the crown by form of law; which the parliament declined, and voted the advisers of that answer, enemies of the kingdom.

Multitudes of petitions were presented to the houses from the city of London, and from the counties of Middlesex, Hertford, Essex, &c.† beseeching them to provide for

* "In the treaty at Uxbridge, printed in king Charles's works, and in Dugdale's Short View of the Troubles of England, and separate by itself in quarto by Litchfield 1645, I can find (says Dr. Grey) no such offer of proof made by Mr. Whitelocke." This is true, and the reason may be assigned; the piece referred to exhibits only the requisitions on one side, and the answers on the other, without going into the detail of matters that were the subjects of conversation merely; but because the assertion of Mr. Neal be not found in the Relation of the Treaty of Uxbridge, and he subjoins no authority for it, Dr. Grey adds, "he will not I hope take it amiss, if we do not implicitly take his word." The reader will judge of the candour and liberality of this insinuation, when he is informed that Mr. Neal spoke on the best authority, that of Mr. Whitelocke himself, Memorials, p. 124; who further tells us, that a motion was made to appoint a day to hear him and sir Edward Hyde (who advanced the doctrine of the king's absolute power over the militia) debate the point, but by the interference of the earl of Southampton, and some other gentlemen, the debate was declined. But the commissioners of both kingdoms on their return to their quarters, gave Whitelocke thanks, and said "the honour of parliament was concerned therein, and vindicated by him."—Ed.

† Dr. Grey observes, with a sneer, that among those petitions were some remarkable ones; namely, one from the porters fifteen hundred in number, another in the name of many thousands of the poor people; and a third from the tradesmen's wives in and about the city of London, delivered by Mrs. Anne Stuggs, a brewer's wife. "These petitions (says the doctor) would have been worthy a place in Mr. Neal's curious

the safety of the nation, by disarming Papists, by taking care of the Protestants in Ireland, by bringing evil counsellors to punishment, by putting the kingdom into a posture of defence, and by committing the forts and castles of the kingdom, to such persons as both houses could confide in; but their hands were tied, because the king, who has the sole execution of the laws, would act no longer in concert with his parliament. The commons, encouraged by the spirit of the people, petitioned a second time for the militia, and framed an ordinance, with a list of the names of such persons in whom they could confide. His majesty, in order to amuse the house and gain time, told them, "that he could not divest himself of that just power that God and the laws of the kingdom had placed in him for the defence of his people, for any indefinite time." After this they presented a third petition to the king at Theobald's [March 1], in which they protest, "that if his majesty persists in that denial, the dangers and distempers of the kingdom were such as would endure no longer delay; and therefore, if his majesty will not satisfy their desires, they shall be enforced, for the safety of the kingdom, to dispose of the militia by authority of both houses of parliament, and they resolve to do it accordingly:"* beseeching his majesty at the same time to reside near his parliament. The king was so inflamed with this protestation, that he told them, "he was amazed at their message, but should not alter his resolution in any point."† And instead of residing near his parliament he removed to Newmarket, and by degrees to York. Upon this the commons voted, March 4, "that the kingdom be forthwith put into a posture of defence by authority of both houses, in such a way as is already agreed upon by both

collection." The contempt which Dr. Grey casts on these petitions, will not appear generous or just to one who reflects on the objects of these petitions, which were highly interesting; who estimates things not by the fluctuation and factitious claims of rank and wealth, but by the standard of reason and rectitude; and who respects the rights of property, how small soever that property be, of security, and of conscience, which attach themselves to every class and order of men. With respect to the petition of the virtuous matrons, and the respect with which it was treated by parliament, who commissioned Mr. Pym to return an answer in person, both are sanctioned by the Roman history: the legislator of that great empire, when towering to its utmost splendour, received and encouraged the petitions of women. Almoudby's History of England, vol. 3. p. 137, 138, the note. The female petitioners, in the instance before us, by their public spirit and the share they took in the common calamities produced by oppression, did honour to themselves and their sex; and the conduct of the house towards them, was not less politic than complaisant.—Ed.

* Rushworth, part 3, vol. 1. p. 423. † Ibid. p. 524.

houses of parliament;"* and next day they published an ordinance for that purpose. March 9, both houses presented a declaration to the king at Newmarket, "expressing the causes of their fears and jealousies, and their earnest desires, that his majesty would put from him those wicked and mischievous counsellors, that have caused these differences between him and his parliament; that he would come to Whitehall, and continue his own and the prince's residence near his parliament, which he may do with more honour and safety than in any other place. We beseech your majesty (say they) to consider in what state you are, and how easy the way is to happiness, greatness, and honour, if you will join with your parliament; this is all we expect, and for this we will return you our lives and fortunes, and do every thing we can to support your just sovereignty and power. But it is not words alone that will secure us; that which we desire is some real effect in granting those things that the present necessities of the kingdom require." They add farther, "that his majesty's removal to so great a distance not only obstructed the proceedings of parliament, but looked like an alienation of the kingdom from himself and family."† His majesty's best friends advised him to take this opportunity of returning to London; "and it must be solely imputed to his majesty's own resolution (says lord Clarendon) that he took not that course;" but instead of this he broke out into a passion, and told them, he had his fears for the true Protestant profession and the laws as well as they: "What would you have? (says his majesty) Have I violated your laws, or denied to pass any bill for the ease of my subjects? I do not ask what you have done for me. God so deal with me and mine, as my intentions are upright for maintaining the true Protestant profession and the laws of the land." Being asked by the earl of Pembroke, whether he would not grant the militia for a little time, his majesty swore by God, "No, not for an hour." When he was put in mind of his frequent violation of the laws, his majesty replied, "that he had made ample reparation, and did not expect to be reproached with the actions of his ministers."‡

As his majesty insisted upon the militia, he claimed also

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 419, folio ed.
† Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 528.
‡ Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 533.

an inalienable right to all the forts and garrisons of the kingdom, with an uncontrollable power to dispose of the arms and ammunition laid up in them, as his proper goods. This the parliament disputed, and maintained, that they were his majesty's only in trust for the public, and that in discharge of this trust the parliament sitting are his counsellors; for if the king had such a property in the forts and magazines as he claimed, he might then sell or transfer them into an enemy's hand as absolutely as a private person may his lands and goods; which is a strange maxim, and contrary to the act of 40 Edw. III.

Many declarations passed between the king and his parliament on this argument, while each party were getting possession of all that they could. The king was contriving to make sure of the magazine of Hull, but the parliament were beforehand with his majesty, and not only secured that important fortress, but got the command of the fleet [March 31], which submitted to the earl of Warwick, whom the parliament appointed to be their admiral.

The ordinance of March 5, for disposing of the militia by both houses of parliament without the king, in cases of extreme danger to the nation, of which danger the two houses were the proper judges, with the subsequent resolutions of March 16, were the grand crisis which divided the house into two parties. Mr. Hyde, afterward lord Clarendon, Mr. Bridgeman, Mr. Palmer, and other eminent lawyers and gentlemen, having given their opinion against the ordinance, quitted their seats, and retired to the king. On the other hand, serjeant Maynard, Whitelocke, Glyn, Selden, the lord-keeper Littleton, Mr. Lee, St. John, Grimston, and divers others of no less judgment in law, and of a superior interest in their country, accepted of commissions in the militia, and continued in the service of the parliament. Many retired to their country-seats, and were for standing neuter in this nice conjuncture; but those that remained in the house were about three hundred, besides fifty that were employed in the country, and about fifty more absent with leave; the rest went over to the king, and were some time after expelled the house. But from this time the sitting members were more resolute, and met with less opposition.

March 15, his majesty acquainted the houses from Hun-

tingdon, with his design to reside for some time at York; and adds, that he expected "they should pay a due regard to his prerogative, and to the laws established; and that none of his subjects should presume, under colour of any order or ordinance of parliament to which his majesty is not a party, to do or execute what is not warrantable by the laws." His majesty's intention, by this message, was to put a stop to all farther proceedings of the parliament, for their own and the nation's security, till they had digested all their grievances into a body. Upon receiving this declaration both houses came to these resolutions among others:

March 16, Resolved, "That those who advise his majesty to absent himself from the parliament, are enemies to the peace of the kingdom, and justly suspected to be favourers of the rebellion in Ireland.*

Resolved, "That the ordinance of parliament for the militia is not inconsistent with the oath of allegiance; but that the several commissions granted by his majesty under the great seal to the lieutenants of the several counties, are illegal and void.†

Resolved, "That in cases of extreme danger, and of his majesty's refusal to act in concert with his parliament, the people ought, by the fundamental laws of the kingdom, to obey the ordinance of both houses concerning the militia; and that such persons as shall be appointed deputy-lieutenants, and are approved by both houses, ought to take upon them to execute their offices.

It was resolved farther, "That the two houses of parliament being the representative body of the whole nation, and two parts in three of the legislature, were the proper judges of the state and condition of it.

Resolved, "That when both houses agreed that the nation was in extreme danger, as they now did, the king was obliged, by the laws of nature as well as by the laws of the land, to agree to those remedies which they who are his great council should advise him to. This seems evident from the statute of 25 Edw. III. entitled, the statute of provisors of benefices, which says, 'that the right of the crown of England, and the laws of the realm, are such, that upon the mischiefs and damages that happen to this realm, our sovereign lord the king ought, and is bound by his oath, with the ac-

* Rushworth, p. 534. † Rapin, vol. 2. p. 432, folio edit.

cord of his people in parliament, to ordain remedy for removing thereof."*

Resolved, "That if in such a time of danger his majesty deserts his parliament, or refuses to concur with them in ordaining such remedies as are absolutely necessary for the common safety, then the two houses ought to look upon themselves as the guardians of the people, and provide for their defence.

Resolved, "That when the lords and commons, which is the supreme court of judicature in the kingdom, shall declare what the law of the land is; to have this not only questioned but contradicted, and a command that it should not be obeyed, is a high breach of the privilege of parliament."

His majesty on the other hand averred, "that the kingdom was in no danger, but from the arbitrary proceedings of the parliament, who were invading the royal prerogative, and subverting the constitution in church and state.

"That if the kingdom was really in danger, he was the guardian and protector of his people, and was answerable to God only for his conduct; but that parliaments were temporary and dissolvable at his pleasure: that he should therefore consider them as his counsellors and advisers, but not his commanders or dictators."

His majesty admitted, "that in some doubtful cases the parliament were judges of the law, but he did not think himself bound to renounce his own judgment and understanding, by passing laws that might separate from his crown that which was in a manner essential to it, viz. a power to protect his subjects."

To which the commons replied, "that the king alone could not be judge in this case, for the king judges not matters of law but by his courts; nor can the courts of law be judges of the state of the kingdom against the parliament, because they are inferior; but as the law is determined by the judges, who are the king's council, so the state of the nation is to be determined by the two houses of parliament, who are the proper judges of the constitution. If therefore the lords and commons in parliament assembled declare this or the other matter to be according to law, or according to the constitution of the kingdom, it is not lawful for any single person or inferior court to contradict it."†

* Rushworth, p. [illegible]

† Ibid. part [illegible] vol. [illegible] p. 603. Rapin p. 477.

But instead of tiring the reader with a long paper war in support of these propositions, I will make one general remark, which may serve as a key to the whole controversy. If we suppose the kingdom to be in its natural state, after the king had withdrawn from his parliament, and would act no longer in concert with them—If the constitution was then entire, and the most considerable grievances redressed—If the laws in being were a sufficient security against the return of Popery and arbitrary power, and there was good reason to believe those laws would have their free course;—then the king's arguments are strong and conclusive; for in all ordinary cases, the administration of justice, and the due execution of the laws, is vested in the crown; nor may the lords and commons in parliament make new laws, or suspend and alter old ones, without his majesty's consent. But on the other hand, if in the opinion* of the lords and commons in parliament assembled, who are the representatives of the whole nation, the constitution is broken; by the king's deserting his two houses, and resolving to act no longer in concert with them, or by any other overt-acts of his majesty's council, inconsistent with the constitution. Or if both houses shall declare† the religion and liberties of the nation to be in imminent danger, either from foreign or domestic enemies, and the king will not concur with his parliament to apply such remedies as the wisdom of his two houses shall think necessary;—then certainly, after proper petitions and remonstrances, they may from the necessity of the case provide for the public safety, as much as in the case of nonage or captivity of the prince. In order therefore to decide in the present controversy, we must make an estimate of the true condition of the nation; whether it was in its natural state; or whether the constitution being divided and broken by the king's deserting his parliament, the legal form of government was not dissolved? In the former case I apprehend the king was in the right; in the latter, the parliament.

This unhappy controversy was managed with great

* It should rather be—if, according to the opinion of the lords and commons, &c.—Ed.

† Rather—if, as both houses shall declare, the religion and liberties of the nation be in imminent danger,—&c. The controversy turns not on the opinion and declaration of the two houses, but on the truth of the facts stated. And these amendments preserve the contrast between the opposite parts of Mr. Neal's proposition: which he is very politely represented by bishop Warburton as not knowing how to state.—Ed.

warmth and mutual reproaches, though with this decency, that the king did not charge his parliament with criminal designs, but only a malignant party in both houses; nor did the parliament reproach the person of the king, but laid all their grievances upon his evil counsellors; however, it is easy to observe, that it was impossible the two parties should agree, because they reasoned upon a different principle; the king supposing the nation was in a sound state, and that therefore the laws ought to take their natural course; the parliament apprehending the constitution broken, and that therefore it was their duty to provide for the public safety, even without the king's concurrence. But we shall have more light into this controversy hereafter.

To return to the history. Though the Scots were made easy at home, being in full possession of their civil and religious rights, yet they could not remain unconcerned spectators of the ruin of the English parliament, partly out of gratitude for the favours they had received, and partly from an apprehension that the security of their own settlement, as well as the introducing their kirk-discipline into England, depended upon it. While the king was at Windsor, the Scots commissioners at London offered their mediation between his majesty and his two houses: in their petition they tell his majesty, "that the liberties of England and Scotland must stand and fall together;" and after some expressions of grief for the distractions of England, which they conceive to arise from the plots of the Papists and prelates, whose aim has been not only to prevent any farther reformation, but to subvert the purity and truth of religion; they offer their service to compose the differences, and beseech his majesty "to have recourse to the faithful advice of both houses of parliament, which will not only quiet the minds of his English subjects, but remove the jealousies and fears that may possess the hearts of his subjects in his other kingdoms." In their paper of the same date to both houses of parliament, January 15, "they return thanks to the parliament of England for the assistance given to the kingdom of Scotland in settling their late troubles; and next to the providence of God and his majesty's goodness, they acknowledge their obligations to the mediation and brotherly kindness of the English parliament; and now by way of return, and to discharge the trust reposed in them, they offer their media-

tion between them and the king, beseeching the houses to consider of the fairest and most likely methods to compose the differences in church and state." Bishop Burnet says, their design was to get episcopacy brought down and presbytery set up, to the first of which most of the members were willing to consent, but few were cordial for the latter.

The king was highly displeased with the Scots mediation, and sent them word that the case of England and Scotland was different; in Scotland, says his majesty, episcopacy was never fully settled by law, and is found to be contrary to the genius of the people; but in England it is rooted in the very constitution, and has flourished without interruption for eighty years; he therefore commands them not to transact between him and his parliament, without first communicating their propositions to him in private. At the same time his majesty sent leters into Scotland, and ordered the chancellor to use his utmost efforts to keep that kingdom to a neutrality. On the other hand, the parliament threw themselves into the arms of the Scots; they thanked the commissioners for their kind and seasonable interposition, and prayed them to continue their endeavours to remove the present distractions, and to preserve the union between the two kingdoms. They wrote likewise into Scotland to the same purpose; the effects of which will appear at the next meeting of their parliament.

In the meantime, the lords and commons, in order to encourage the expectations of their friends in both kingdoms, published the following declaration of their intentions:

"*Die Sabbati, April* 9, 1642.

"The lords and commons declare, that they intend a due and necessary reformation of the government and discipline of the church, and to take away nothing in the one but what will be evil and justly offensive, or at least unnecessary and burdensome; and for the better effecting thereof, speedily to have consultation with godly and learned divines; and because this will never of itself attain the ends sought therein, they will use their utmost endeavours to establish learned and preaching ministers, with a good and sufficient maintenance, throughout the whole kingdom, wherein many dark corners are miserably destitute of the means of salvation, and many poor ministers want necessary provision."

This declaration was ordered to be published by the sheriffs of the several counties, for the satisfaction of the people.

The distance between London and York increased the misunderstanding between the king and his parliament; numbers of passengers travelling between the two places with secret intelligence, the parliament appointed the following oath to be taken by all who came from the king's quarters.

"I A. B. do swear from my heart, that I will not, directly or indirectly, adhere unto or willingly assist the king in this war, or in this cause against the parliament, nor any forces raised without consent of the two houses of parliament, in this cause or war. And I do likewise swear, that my coming, and submitting myself under the power and protection of parliament, is without any manner or design whatsoever to the prejudice of the proceedings of this present parliament, and without direction, privity, or advice, of the king, or any of his council or officers, other than I have made known. So help me God and the contents of this book."

This was called the negative oath, and was voted April 5, 1642.

As soon as the correspondence was thus interrupted, numbers of libellous newspapers, mercuries, and weekly intelligencers, began to appear full of scandal and reproach, whereby the conduct of great and wise men was aspersed, innumerable false reports spread through the nation, and the spirits of the people sharpened for war. On the side of the king was Mercurius Aulicus; and on the side of the parliament Mercurius Britannicus: when the king fixed his court at Oxford, the learned garrison drew their pens for the king, as the politicians of London did for the parliament; and while the armies were in the field, these gentlemen employed themselves in celebrating their wonderful exploits to the people; so that besides the above-mentioned weekly papers, there appeared Mercurius Rusticus—Pragmaticus—Politicus—Publicus—diurnals and intelligencers without number. The pulpits also were employed in the same work; the preachers dealt too much in politics, and made free with the characters and actions of their superiors: there were incendiaries on both sides: the king's preachers enhanced his majesty's character, and treated the parliament

as rebels and traitors;* and the parliament-ministers were no less culpable, for though they avoided speaking disrespectfully of the person of the king, they declaimed against the hierarchy, against evil and Popish counsellors, and glanced at the queen herself, as preventing the harmony between his majesty and the parliament, and pushing him upon measures that were destructive to the Protestant religion and the constitution of their country; which, how true soever in itself, was a subject very unfit for the pulpit.

The great resort of the nobility and gentry to the court at York, gave his majesty new life, and encouraged him to treat his parliament with very sovereign language; he sent them word, that "he would have nothing extorted from him; nor would he grant them any thing farther that the law had put into his hands."† At the same time his majesty attempted to seize upon the magazine of Hull, pursuant to the scheme formed at Windsor in January last; and accordingly appeared before the town with three hundred horse, April 23, but was denied entrance with more than twelve attendants; whereupon, after an hour's time allowed for deliberation, his majesty caused sir John Hotham the governor to be proclaimed a traitor by two heralds at arms, and then retired to York full of resentment for the affront he had received, which he did not fail to communicate to the parliament, demanding justice against sir John Hotham according to law; however, the parliament stood by their governor, and ordered the arms and ammunition in Hull to be removed to the Tower of London, except what was necessary for the defence of the place.

Upon his majesty's return to York, he commanded the committee of parliament, which were spies upon his actions, to retire to London, but they excused themselves, as being ordered to continue by those who employed them. His majesty also summoned the nobility and gentry of the northern counties to meet him at York [May 12], when he acquainted them with his reasons for refusing the militia-bill, and with the treasonable behaviour of sir John Hotham in keeping him out of Hull, and depriving him of his magazine, being his own proper goods. "Since treason is countenanced so near me (says his majesty), it is time to look to my safety; none can blame me to apprehend danger, I am therefore re-

* Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 760. † Rapin, p. 351.

solved to have a guard——." The gentry were divided in their sentiments about the king's conduct, and gave answers as they were differently affected, though all were willing to serve his majesty according to law. After several other assemblies of the nobility, gentry, freeholders, and ministers of York, had been held by his majesty's command, in all which he declared, that "he was resolved to defend the true Protestant religion established in the reign of queen Elizabeth; to govern by law for the future; and that he had no intention to make war with his parliament, except it were in way of defence;"* a regiment of horse was raised for the security of his majesty's person, and the command given to the prince of Wales. This was the first levy of troops in the civil war, his majesty having as yet only a regiment of the militia of six hundred men, besides the reformadoes that attended the court.

About the same time [May 17] the king ordered the courts of justice to remove from Westminster to York, and sent for serjeant-major Skippon, an old experienced officer, to attend him in person, which the parliament prevented; but were not so successful in relation to the great seal, which the keeper sent privately to the king by the messenger that came for it [May 22], and next day followed himself. This was a sensible disappointment to the parliament, especially as it was attended with the loss of nine other peers, who deserted their stations in the house about the same time, and went over to the king, as did considerable numbers of the commons, his majesty having now given orders to all his friends to leave the house and repair to him, which, instead of breaking up the parliament, as was intended, strengthened the hands of the country party, and gave them an opportunity after some time of expelling the deserters.

Things being come to this crisis, the parliament voted May 20, "that it was now apparent that the king, seduced by wicked counsel, intended to make war upon the parliament.——That whensoever the king maketh such war it is a breach of trust, contrary to his coronation-oath, and tending to the dissolution of the government.——That whosoever shall serve or assist his majesty in such war are traitors, and have been so adjudged by two acts of parliament 11 Rich. II. and 1 Henry IV.——May 28, they ordered all she-

* Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 615. 624. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 451, 455, fol. ed.

riffs and justices of peace, &c. to make stay of all arms and ammunition carrying to York, and to disperse all forces coming together by the king's commission."

To justify their respective proceedings, both parties published their reasons to the world; a summary of which being contained in the parliament's memorial of May 19, and the king's answer, I shall give the reader an abstract of them.

The parliament in their memorial avow, in the presence of the all-seeing Deity, "that the sincerity of their endeavours has been directed only by the king's honour and the public peace, free from all private aims, personal respects and passions whatsoever. They complain of his majesty's being drawn into the north, far from his parliament, which has given occasion to many false rumours and scandalous reports, to the interrupting the good understanding between the king and his parliament.——They take notice of those evil counsellors which have prevailed with his majesty to make infractions upon his royal word, as that, 'On the word of a king, and as I am a gentleman, I will redress the grievances of my people.—I am resolved to put myself on the love and affection of my English subjects.—We do engage solemnly, on the word of a king, that the security of all, and every one of you, from violence, is and shall be as much my care, as the preservation of us and our children.' Since which time the studies and chambers of some of the members had been broken open, and six of them attempted to be seized in the parliament-house, the blame of which they are willing to impute to his evil counsellors. And though the king disavows such counsellors, we hold it our duty (say they) humbly to avow, there are such, else we must say, that all the ill things done in his majesty's name have been done by himself, wherein we should neither follow the direction of the law, which says, the king can do no wrong; nor the affection of our own hearts, which is to clear his majesty as much as may be of all misgovernment, and to lay the fault upon his ministers.* If any ill be done in matters of state the council are to answer for it, and if any matters of law the judges. They acknowledge the many excellent acts that his majesty had lately passed for the advantage of his subjects," but then add, "that in none of

* Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 693.

them have they bereaved his majesty of any just, necessary, or profitable prerogative of the crown. They declare their disallowance of all seditious libels, but complain of many mutinous petitions that have been presented to the king to divide him from his parliament; and whereas the king had insinuated, that the church was to be destroyed to make way for presbytery, they aver, that they desire no more than to encourage piety and learning, and to place learned and pious preachers in all parishes, with a sufficient maintenance.—Upon the whole they aver the kingdom to be in imminent danger from enemies abroad, and a Popish and discontented party at home, and that in such a case the kingdom must not be without means to preserve itself. They aver that the ordinary means of providing for the public safety is in the king and parliament;* but because the king, being only a single person, may be liable to many accidents, the wisdom of the state in such cases has intrusted the two houses of parliament to supply what shall be wanting on the part of the prince, as in cases of captivity, nonage, or where the royal trust is not discharged; which the lords and commons having declared to be the present case, there needs no farther authority to affirm it; nor is it in the power of any person or court to revoke that judgment. They then mention some proofs of the nation's danger, and conclude with praying for the protection of Almighty God upon the king, and beseech his majesty to cast from him his evil counsellors, assuring him and the whole kingdom, that they desire nothing more than to preserve the purity and power of religion, to honour the king in all his just prerogatives, and to endeavour to the utmost of their power, that all parishes may have learned and pious preachers, and those preachers competent livings. And they doubt not to overcome all difficulties, if the people do not desert them to their own undoing; and even in this cause, they declare they will not betray their trust, but look beyond their own lives and estates, as thinking nothing worth enjoying without the liberty, peace, and safety, of the kingdom, nor any thing too much to be hazarded for the obtaining of it."†

His majesty, in his answer, is not willing to charge his parliament with misbehaviour, but only a malignant party

* Ibid. p. 699.

† Rushworth, vol. 1 p. 704. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 412, folio.

in both houses. He denies the several plots and conspiracies mentioned in their declaration, and takes notice of their misapplying the word "parliament" to the vote of both houses, whereas the king is an essential part of the parliament. His majesty confesses that his going to the house of commons to seize the five members was an error in form, but maintains the matter of the accusation to be just, and therefore thinks he ought not to be reproached with it. He neither affirms nor denies the design of bringing the army to London, but quibbles with the words "design" and "resolution," as Rapin observes, king Charles I. being very skilful in such sort of ambiguities. His majesty made no reply to the parliaments reasoning upon the head, of the king's neglecting to discharge his trust, but seems to insinuate, that the parliament should in no case meddle with the government without an express law. He denies his knowledge of any evil counsellors about him; and declares that he did not willingly leave his parliament, but was driven away by the tumults at Whitehall; and adds, that by the help of God and the laws of the land, he would have justice for those tumults; nor does his majesty own the promoting or retaining in his service any who are disaffected to the laws of the kingdom; but he will not take a vote of parliament for his guide, till it is evident they are without passion or affection. The king charges them home with the greatest violation of the laws and liberties of the subject. "What is become of the law that man was born to? (says he) And where is magna charta, if the vote of parliament may make a law?" His majesty concludes with a severe remark on the parliament's calling the petitions presented to him "mutinous." "Hath a multitude of mean inconsiderable people about the city of London had liberty to petition against the government of the church, against the Book of Common Prayer, &c. and been thanked for it? And shall it be called mutiny in the gravest and best citizens in London, and gentry of Kent, to frame petitions to be governed by the known laws of the land, and not by votes of parliament? Is not this evidently the work of a faction? Let heaven and earth, God and man, judge between us and these men!"

The reader will judge of the weight of these declarations according to a former remark. The parliament supposes the "nation in imminent danger, and the royal power not

exerted in its defence; in which case they, as guardians of the people, apprehend themselves empowered to act in its defence. The king supposes the nation to be in its natural state, and in no manner of danger, but from a malignant party within the two houses, and that therefore the laws should have their free and ordinary course. Upon these contrary suppositions the arguments on both sides are invincible; but (as has been already observed) it was impossible they should produce any good effect, till it was first agreed whether the nation was in danger, or whether the royal promise might be relied upon with safety.

On the 2d of June the parliament presented the king with the sum of all their desires for the reformation and security of church and state, in nineteen propositions, according to his majesty's command in January last. Those which relate to the state are built upon the supposition above mentioned, that the nation was in imminent danger; and that after so many infractions of the royal word, it was not to be relied upon for the execution of the laws but in conjunction with the parliament. They therefore pray, "that his majesty's privy-counsellors, commanders of forts and garrisons, and all the great officers of state, may be approved by the two houses; that the judges may hold their places *quam diu se bene gesserint;* that the militia may be in the hands of the parliament for the present; that all public business may be determined by a majority of the council, and that they may take an oath to maintain the petition of right, and such other laws as shall be enacted this present session. They pray that the justice of parliament may pass upon delinquents; that the lord Kimbolton and the five members may be effectually cleared by act of parliament, and that his majesty would enter into alliances with foreign princes for the support of the Protestant religion," &c. It it hard to express his majesty's resentment against all these propositions (except the two last), which he says were fit only to be offered to a vanquished prisoner; that he were unworthy of his noble descent if he should part with such flowers of the crown as are worth all the rest of the garland. "If these things are granted (says he) we may have the title of a king, and be waited upon bareheaded; we may have our hand kissed, and have swords and maces carried before us, but as to real power we should remain but the

outside, the picture, the sign, of a king." His majesty therefore rejected them in the gross, with this sovereign reply, "Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari."

The propositions relating to religion are these:

Prop. 4. "That he or they to whom the government and education of the king's children shall be committed, be approved of by both houses of parliament, and in the intervals of parliament by the majority of the privy-council; and that such servants against whom the houses have any just exception be removed.*

Prop. 5. "That the marriages of the king's children be with consent of parliament, under penalty of a præmunire on such as shall conclude them otherwise, and not to be pardoned but by parliament.

Prop. 6. "That the laws in force against Jesuits, priests, and Popish recusants, be strictly put in execution, without any toleration or dispensation to the contrary; and that some more effectual course may be enacted by authority of parliament, to disable them from making any disturbance in the state, or eluding the laws by trusts or otherwise.

Prop. 7. "That the votes of Popish lords in the house of peers may be taken away, so long as they continue Papists; and that your majesty will consent to such a bill as shall be drawn, for the education of the children of Papists by Protestants, in the Protestant religion.

Prop. 8. "That your majesty will be pleased to consent, that such a reformation be made of the church government and liturgy, as both houses of parliament shall advise, wherein they intend to have consultation with divines, as is expressed in their declaration for that purpose; and that your majesty will contribute your best assistance for the raising of a sufficient maintenance for preaching ministers through the kingdom; and that your majesty will be pleased to give your consent to the laws, for the taking away of innovations and superstitions, and of pluralities, and against scandalous ministers."

To these propositions his majesty replied as follows:

To the fourth and fifth concerning the education and disposal of his children, "that he had committed them to the care of persons of quality, integrity, and piety, with special regard to their education in the principles of the true Pro-

* Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 793

testant religion, but that he would never part with that trust, which God, nature, and the laws of the land, had placed in him; nor would he suffer any to share with him in his power of treaties; but he assured them, that he would not entertain any treaty of marriage for his children without due regard to the Protestant religion, and the honour of his family; and that he would take such care of the prince of Wales, and his other children, as should justify him to God as a father, and to his dominions as a king."

To the sixth proposition, concerning Popish recusants, his majesty admitted, "that if they could find any more effectual course to disable them from disturbing the state, or eluding the laws, by trust or otherwise, he ought to give his consent to it."

To the seventh, concerning the votes of Popish lords, his majesty replied, "that he was informed, those lords had prudently withdrawn from the house of peers, but he did not conceive that a law against the votes of any, where blood gave them their right, was so proper, in regard of the privilege of parliament; however, his majesty was content, that as long as they did not conform to the doctrine and discipline of the church of England, they should not sit in the house of peers, but only vote by proxy. As for a bill for the educating the children of Papists in the Protestant religion, he should be very glad of it, and would encourage it."

To the eighth proposition, touching reformation of church government and liturgy, his majesty refers them to his declaration of December 1, in which he had declared, "that he was willing to remove illegal innovations; that if his parliament advised him to call a synod to examine into such ceremonies as gave offence, he would take it into consideration, and apply himself to give due satisfaction therein; but he was persuaded in his conscience, that no church could be found upon earth, that professed the true religion with more purity of doctrine than the church of England; nor where the government and discipline are more beautified, and free from superstition, than as they are here established by law; which his majesty is determined with constancy to maintain, as long as he lives, in their purity and glory, not only against all innovations of Popery, but from the irreverence of those many schismatics and separatists wherewith of late this

kingdom and the city of London abound, for the suppression of whom his majesty requires the assistance of his parliament. As for such matters in religion which were in their own nature indifferent, his majesty refers them to his first declaration, printed by advice of his privy-council, in which he had declared, that he was willing, in tenderness to any number of his loving subjects, to admit that some law might be made for the exemption of tender consciences from punishment or prosecution for such ceremonies; provided it be attempted and pursued with that modesty, temper, and submission, that the peace and quiet of the kingdom be not disturbed, the decency and comeliness of God's service discountenanced, nor the pious, sober, devout actions of the first reformers scandalized and defamed. His majesty adds, that he had formerly referred the composing the present distractions about church government and liturgy to the wisdom of the parliament, but desired he might not be pressed to any single act on his part, till the whole be so digested and settled by both houses, that his majesty may clearly see what is fit to be left as well as what is fit to be taken away. His majesty observes with satisfaction, that they desire only a reformation, and not, as is daily preached in conventicles, a destruction of the present discipline and liturgy, and promises to concur with his parliament in raising a sufficient maintenance for preaching ministers, in such manner as shall be most for the advancement of piety and learning; but as for the other bills, against superstitious innovations and pluralities, his majesty can say nothing to them, till he sees them."

It was now apparent to all men, that this controversy, which had hitherto been debated by the pen, must be decided by the sword; for this purpose the queen was all this while in Holland negotiating foreign supplies: her majesty pledged the crown-jewels, and with the money arising from thence purchased a small frigate of thirty-two guns, called the Providence, and freighted it with two hundred barrels of powder, two or three thousand arms, seven or eight field-pieces, and some ready money for the king's service, all which were safely convoyed to his majesty at York, about the beginning of June. The parliament had been advertised of the queen's proceedings, and acquainted the king with their advices; which at first he was pleased to disown, for

in his declaration of March 9, he tells the parliament, "Whatsoever you are advertised from Paris, &c. of foreign aids, we are confident no sober honest man in our kingdom can believe, that we are so desperate, or so senseless, as to entertain such designs as would not only bury this our kingdom in certain destruction and ruin, but our name and posterity in perpetual scorn and infamy."* One would think by this that the king did not know what was doing with the crown-jewels, though they were carried over with his leave, and, as Mr. Whitelocke† says, that with them and the assistance of the prince of Orange, a sufficient party might be raised for the king. But in this answer, as in most others, his majesty had his ambiguities and reservations.‡

It was the king's great misfortune never to get possession of a convenient place of strength upon the coast. The governor of Portsmouth declaring for him, the parliament immediately ordered the militia of the country to block up the place by land, while the earl of Warwick did the same by sea, so that it was forced to surrender for want of provision, before the king could relieve it. The like disappointment befel his majesty at Hull, which he besieged a second time, July 4,§ with three thousand foot and about one thousand horse, while sir J. Pennington the king's admiral blocked it up by sea; but the governor drawing up the sluices laid the country under water, and obliged the army to retire. This was a severe disappointment, because his majesty had sent word to the parliament June 14, that

* Clarendon, vol. 1. part 2 p. 415. 462. † Memorials, p. 52.

‡ Bishop Warburton contends that by "foreign aids" the king understood, what the parliament certainly meant, foreign troops. His lordship therefore asserts, "there is no ambiguity here; but there is neither end nor measure (he adds) to this historian's prejudices and false representations." The exact state of the matter is, that the parliament in their declaration do use the words "foreign force," and explicitly mention the loan of four thousand men apiece by the kings of France and Spain. The king in his answer says, only in general, "that whatever their advertisements from Rome, &c. were, he was confident no sober honest man," &c. without using, as Mr. Neal inaccurately represents him doing, the terms "foreign aids." But will it follow from hence, that the king's answer was free from ambiguity and reservation, or Mr. Neal's charge false? If what Mr. Whitelocke says were true, there was a duplicity and ambiguity in the king's reply: and it consisted in this, not in the use of an equivocal term, but in censuring the measures, of which he was suspected, as senseless, desperate, and pernicious; at the same time he was actually taking such or similar steps.—Ed.

§ According to Dr. Grey, there is an error in this date; for the king issued a proclamation of his intention to besiege Hull, upon the 11th of July; so could not lay siege to it upon the 4th. Ed.

"by the help of God and the law, he would have justice upon those that kept him out of Hull, or lose his life in requiring it."*

On the other hand the commons, upon the desertion of the king's friends, ordered a general call of the house June 16, and that every member should answer to his name on forfeiture of 100*l*. The lords ordered the nine peers that went after the great seal, to appear at their bar June 8. and for their nonappearance [June 27] deprived them of their privilege of voting in the house during the present parliament. As the commons had taken all imaginable precautions to hinder the king from getting the forts and magazines of the kingdom into his possession, they ordered all suspected places to be searched for arms and ammunition; in the archbishop's palace at Lambeth they seized arms for about five hundred men, and lodged them in the Tower of London; in Cobham-hall they seized five cart-loads of arms; and below Gravesend about one hundred pieces of cannon. As soon as they heard the king had received supplies from beyond sea, and was preparing to besiege Hull, they ordered their ordinance for raising the militia to be put in execution in Essex [June 7], when all the regiments appeared full, besides a great number of volunteers, who declared they would stand by the parliament in this cause with their lives and fortunes. The king forbade the militia's appearing in arms without his consent, according to the statute 7 Eliz. cap. 1, and issued out commissions of array, according to an old statute of 5 Henry IV. appointing several persons of quality to array, muster, and train the people in the several counties; but the parliament by a declaration endeavoured to prove these commissions to be illegal, contrary to the petition of right, and to a statute of this present parliament; and went on with mustering the militia in several other counties, where the spirit of the people appeared to be with them. The execution of these counter-commissions occasioned some skirmishes wherever the two parties happened to meet.

On the 10th of June 1642, the parliament published proposals for borrowing money upon the public faith at eight per cent. interest, allowing the full value of the plate, besides one shilling per ounce consideration for the fashion.

* Rushworth, p. 601.

Upon information of this, the king immediately wrote to the lord-mayor of London, to forbid the citizens lending their money or plate, upon pain of high treason; notwithstanding which such vast quantities were brought into Guildhall within ten days, that there were hardly officers enough to receive it. Mr. Echard computes the plate at 11,000,000*l.* which is monstrous, for in reality it was but 1,267,326*l.*: the gentry of London and Middlesex brought in the best of their plate, and the meaner sort their gold rings, thimbles, and bodkins. Lord Clarendon says, this zeal of the people arose from the influence and industry of their preachers; which might be true in part, though it was rather owing to a quick and feeling apprehension of the danger of their liberties and religion, by an inundation of Popery and arbitrary power.

The king also tried his credit with the people, by publishing a declaration inviting his subjects to bring in their money, plate, horses, and arms, to York, upon the security of his forests and parks for the principal, and eight per cent. interest, with very little success, except among the courtiers and the two universities.

July 7, his majesty sent letters to the vice-chancellor and heads of colleges in Oxford, desiring them to lend him their public stock, engaging upon the word of a king to allow them eight per cent. for that and all other sums of money that any private gentleman or scholar should advance. Hereupon it was unanimously agreed in convocation, to intrust his majesty with their public stock, amounting to 860*l.* which was immediately delivered to Mr. Chaworth, his majesty's messenger. The several colleges also sent his majesty their plate; and private gentlemen contributed considerable sums of money, to the value of above 10,000*l.** The two houses at Westminster being informed of these proceedings, published an ordinance, declaring this act of the university "a breach of trust, and an alienation of the public money, contrary to the intent of the pious donors, and therefore not to be justified by the laws of God or man;" that it was also contrary to their engagements, for the university being yet in the hands of the parliament, the lord Say and his deputy-lieutenants had been with the several masters and heads of houses, and obtained a solemn promise

* Clarendon, vol. 2. p. 88.

from each of them, that their plate should be forthcoming, and should not be made use of by the king against the parliament; and yet contrary to their engagement they sent it away privately to York, where it arrived July 18, as appeared by his majesty's most gracious letter of thanks.* As soon as the two houses were informed of this, they sent for the four principal managers of this affair into custody, viz. Dr. Prideaux bishop of Worcester, Dr. Samuel Fell dean of Christ-church, Dr. Frewen, and Dr. Potter, who absconded, and the scholars, encouraged by their principals, bought arms, formed themselves into companies, and laying aside their academical studies, were instructed in the art of war, and performed the military exercises under their respective captains and leaders. Such was the zeal of the vice-chancellor Dr. Pink, that not content with marshalling the university, he promoted the king's commission of array among the townsmen, and received one of his majesty's troops of horse into garrison, for which he was afterward apprehended and committed to the Gate-house at Westminster. The parliament, provoked with this behaviour of the university, threatened to quarter some of their own regiments upon them, which frightened away half the scholars, and put the rest into such a terrible panic, that the vice-chancellor thought proper to write the following submissive letter to the earl of Pembroke their chancellor:

"Right honourable:

"May it please your lordship to know, that this university is now in extreme danger of suffering all the calamities that warlike forces may bring upon it.† Such forces, we hear for certain, are some of them already on their march, and others are raising to assault us; and, if they may have their wills, to destroy us! My lord, you have been solicitous whom to appoint your chancellor for next year, but if these forces come forward, and do that execution upon us that we fear they intend, there will be no use at all for a vice-chancellor, for what will be here for him to do, where there will be no scholars for him to govern? Or what should scholars do here, having no libraries left them to study in, no schools to dispute in, chapels to serve God in, colleges or halls to live or lodge in, but have all these ransacked, defaced, demolished, so as posterity may

* Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 759. † Ibid. part 3. vol. 2. p. 11.

have to say, See! here was for a long time, and till such a year, a university of great renown and eminence in all manner of learning and virtue, but now laid utterly waste, and buried in her own ruins. And then the question will be, What! had we no lord-chancellor? or was not he able to protect us?—We are all confident that if your lordship would interpose for us to the honourable houses of parliament for our safety and security, all would be well with us. The delinquents that were sent for are not one of them here at this time. Sir John Byron, with his regiment of troopers, we shall soon prevail with to withdraw from us, if he may with safety march back to the king, who of his own gracious care of us sent him hither. And if your lordship shall be secured, that no other forces shall be here imposed upon us, that will take the liberty to exercise that barbarous insolence with which the illiterately rude and ruffianly rabble of the vulgar threaten us; against such only our young men have lately taken in hand the arms we have (a very few God knows, and in weak hands enough) to save themselves and us from having our libraries fired, our colleges pillaged, and our throats cut by them, if they should suddenly break in upon us. And this, my lord, is all the sinful intent we have had in permitting them to train in a voluntary and peaceable manner so as they have done. Good, my lord, that which I most earnestly beg of your honour is, that at the humble request of the university you would put in action with all speed, what may be most prevalent with the parliament for the peace and security of this place, and for the staying of our students, a great part of whom (such stout and hardy men they are), upon alarms and frights, such as have been hourly here of late, are fled away from us home to their mothers. The disciples, when in danger of drowning, clamoured our Saviour, 'Master, carest thou not that we perish?' But I am bold to assume for your honour, and to assure all of this university under your happy government, that you will not suffer us to perish; and that you will at this time give us a clear and real evidence of it, having this representation of the peril we are now in, made to your honour by me,

"Your lordship's humble servant,

"Provost, vice-chancellor of Oxford."

September 12, 1642.

This letter being sent two months after the university had conveyed their plate and money to the king; after they had refused to send up such principal managers of that affair as the parliament had demanded; after they had taken up arms, and received a regiment of his majesty's forces into garrison, the earl of Pembroke only returned the following angry answer:

"Sir,

"If you had desired my advice and assistance in time, I should willingly have contributed my best endeavours for your safety and protection, but your own unadvised counsels and actions have reduced you to the straits you are now in: and in discretion you might have foreseen, that the admitting cavaliers, and taking up arms, could not but make the university a notorious mark of opposition against the parliament, and therefore to be opposed by it. If you had contained yourselves within the decent modest bounds of a university, you might justly have challenged me, if I had not performed the duty of a chancellor. The best counsel I now can give you is, that you presently dismiss the cavaliers, and yield up to the parliament such delinquents as are among you; then the cause being taken away the effect will follow. When you have put yourselves into the right posture of a university, I will be a faithful servant to you, and ready to do you all the good offices I can with the parliament, as I am now sorry you have brought upon yourselves these troubles.

"I rest your very true friend,

Sept. 13, 1642. "Pembroke and Montgomery."

Cambridge university followed the example of Oxford, for upon reading his majesty's letter of June 29 to the vice-chancellor Dr. Holdsworth, they readily agreed also to intrust the king with their public money: what the whole sum amounted to does not appear; but may be guessed by the particulars of one college, a receipt for which is preserved among the archives, and is as follows:

"July 2, 1642.

"Received, the day and year above written, of Wm. Beale, doctor in divinity, master of St. John's college in the university of Cambridge, for the king's use (according to the intendment and direction of his majesty's letters of the 29th of June last, to the vice-chancellor of the said uni-

versity) the sum of 150*l.* I say, received from the treasury of the said college by me,* John Poley."

This Mr. Poley was fellow of Pembroke-hall, and one of the proctors of the university. When the king had secured their money, he sent to borrow their plate, under pretence of preserving it from the parliament; for this purpose he wrote another letter to the vice-chancellor, with directions to take an exact account, not only of the weight but also of the form of every piece, together with the names, arms, and mottoes, of the respective donors, that if his majesty should not preserve it as entire as it was, he might restore it hereafter in the same weight and form, and with the same marks, all which he ensured upon his royal word. There is no account remaining of what plate the colleges delivered up for his majesty's use, though many wished, says Mr. Fuller, that every ounce had been a pound for his sake; but in the treasury of St. John's college there are the particulars of what plate that college delivered in, together with the weight, forms, and names, of the chief benefactors, which amounts in the whole, according to avoirdupois weight, to two thousand sixty-five ounces and a half, as expressed in the following receipt:

"August 8, 1642.

"I do acknowledge that there has been delivered to me, in the name and on the behalf of the master, fellows, and scholars, of St. John's college in Cambridge, two fir boxes, marked with these three letters, S. J. C. containing in them all the several pieces of plate above written, which said plate weigheth, as appears by the particulars, two thousand sixty-five ounces and a half, more or less, which they deposited into the king's hands for the security thereof, and his majesty's service, according to the tenor of his majesty's letters, written and directed to the vice-chancellor of the university.† John Poley."

According to this calculation the king might receive from all the colleges together about 8 or 10,000*l.* in plate, besides money. Colonel Oliver Cromwell with his company of soldiers endeavoured to intercept the convoy, but under the conduct of Mr. Barnaby Oley their guide, who was acquainted with all the by-roads, they escaped the enemy, and

* Dr. Barwick's Life, p. 24. † Ibid. p. 24.

delivered up their charge to the king about the time when he was setting up his royal standard at Nottingham. Cromwell having missed the convoy returned to Cambridge, and took possession of the town and university for the parliament, who, being acquainted with what was done, sent them an angry message, as they had done to Oxford, full of resentments for their disposing of the public money, contrary to the trust reposed in them. The masters and fellows excused themselves, by alleging the royal mandate; whereupon the two houses sent a mandate of their own to the vice-chancellor and heads of colleges in convocation assembled, desiring them to contribute their assistance to the cause in which they [the parliament] were engaged; but though, as Dr. Barwick observes, the commander of the garrison kept them sitting till midnight they would lend nothing, because they apprehended it to be contrary to religion and a good conscience; the houses therefore ordered Dr. Beal, Dr. Martin, and Dr. Sterne, masters of St. John's, Jesus', and Queen's college, into custody; * upon which many of the scholars deserted their stations, and listed in the king's service.

Besides the two universities the king applied under-hand to the Papists, who were firm to his interest, though he durst not as yet avow his correspondence with them; for in his declaration of June 3, he assures the ministers and freeholders of Yorkshire, that he would not make use of foreigners, or of persons disaffected to the Protestant religion——Again, we have taken order that the power of the sword shall not come into the hands of Papists†——August 10, his majesty commands that no Papist should be listed as a soldier in his army; which was expedient, to avoid as much as possible the reproach of an alliance with those people, who were at this time become infamous by the Irish massacre. Though his majesty had but few Roman Catholics among his own forces, the duke of Newcastle's army was filled with them, and Popery was countenanced to that degree at York, that mass was said in every corner of the street, and the Protestants so affronted, that they were al-

* They were immediately after carried to London by Cromwell, and confined in the Tower and other prisons for some years, particularly in the noisome hold of a ship. Dr. Grey; Barwick's Life, p. 52, note t; and Fuller's History of Cambridge, p. 103. Ed.

† Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1 p. 692.

most afraid to go to church.* The king applied to his Roman-Catholic subjects to advance two or three years of the rent that they paid as a composition for their estates as recusants; which they not only complied with, but wrote to their friends abroad to borrow more; proclamation was made at Bruges, and other parts of Flanders, that all people who would lend any money to maintain the Romon Catholics in England, should have it repaid in a year's time with many thanks.

The Lancashire Papists, having been lately disarmed by order of parliament, petitioned his majesty, that since the war was begun, their arms might be redelivered, that they might be in a capacity to defend his majesty's royal person, and their own families. To which his majesty consented in the following words:

——"The laws for disarming recusants being to prevent dangers in a time of peace, but not intended to bar you from the use of arms in time of war for your own safety, or the defence of our person——Our will and command therefore is, and we charge and require you upon your allegiance, that with all possible speed you provide sufficient arms for yourselves, your servants, and your tenants, which we authorize and require you to keep and use for the defence of us, yourselves, and your country, against all forces raised against us, under colour of any order or ordinance of parliament; and we shall use our utmost power to protect you and yours against all injuries and violence.†

"Given under our signet at Chester, September 27, in the eighteenth year of our reign."

* Dr. Grey would impeach the truth of this detail, and says, that as Mr. Neal "quotes no authority for these particulars, I am willing to believe, that they are not all of them true." As to the first particular, I can refer for Mr Neal to Rapin, vol. 2. p. 463, and the matter has been, within these few years, stated and discussed by Mrs. Macaulay, vol. 3. p. 377, 378. 8vo. The fact was admitted by the earl of Newcastle himself, and he published a long declaration, partly to vindicate *himself* on this head; which is preserved in Rushworth, part 3. vol. 2. p. 78, &c. Though I am not able to ascertain the authorities on which the author states the other particulars, a letter of intelligence of the affairs in Yorkshire, which the parliament received, and which has been given to the public since Mr. Neal's history appeared, affords a general confirmation to his account. It represents that the Papists, after the king's proclamation for raising his standard, flocked from Ireland, Lancashire, and all parts of Yorkshire, to York; that there were great rejoicings amongst them, and a great forwardness to assist the service shewn. The circumstances represented by our author, were not unnatural or improbable consequences of such a confidence and exultation of the Papists. And it appears from this letter, that the cavaliers in general, were guilty of tumults, outrages, and depredations. Parliam. hist. History, vol. 11. p. 335. 381. 405, quoted by Mrs. Macaulay, vol. 3. p. 378, 379. 8vo. Edit.

† Rushworth, vol. 2. part 3. p. 50.

Agreeably to this, Mr. George Tempest, a priest, writes to his brother in the king's army, "Our priests at Lancaster are at liberty; Catholic commanders are admitted, and all well enough that way; God Almighty, as I hope, will better prosper the cause." And another adds, "that there is no prosecution of priest or Papist in Northumberland."

When the parliament objected this to his majesty, and named the very officers, he was highly displeased, and in his answer makes use of these solemn expressions: "for that continued dishonest accusation, of our inclination to the Papists, which the authors of it in their own consciences know to be most unjust and groundless, we can say no more, and we can do no more, to the satisfaction of the world—— That any priests or Jesuits imprisoned have been released by us out of the jail of Lancaster, or any other jail, is as false as the father of lies can invent. Neither are the persons named in that declaration, to whom commissions are supposed to be granted for places of command in this war, so much as known to us; nor have they any command, or to our knowledge are present in our army. And it is strange, that our oaths and protestations before Almighty God, for the maintenance of the Protestant religion, should be so slighted——We desire to have our protestations believed by the evidence of our actions."* Surely this solemn appeal to Almighty God was ambiguous and evasive! or else we must conclude, that his majesty was very little acquainted with what was done in his name, and by his commission.

It was only five days after this, that the mask was thrown off, for his majesty confesses, in his declaration of October 27, that the malice and fury of his enemies had reduced him to the necessity of accepting the service and affection of any of his good subjects, whatsoever their religion was; that he did know of some few Papists, whose eminent abilities in command and conduct had moved him to employ them in his service; but he assures his good subjects, that he would always use his endeavours to suppress their religion, by executing the laws already in force against Papists, and in concurring in any other remedies which his two houses should think proper.

As the king was reduced to the necessity of accepting the service and affection of the Papists; so on the other hand,

* Rushworth, vol. 2. part 3 p. 31.

the parliament took all imaginable care to cultivate a good correspondence with the Scots, and to secure that nation in their interests. We have remembered that the Scots commissioners at London offered their mediation in the beginning of the year, which the parliament accepted; but the king, from his extreme hatred of the presbyterian discipline, refused, commanding them to be content with their own settlement, and not meddle in the affairs of another nation. But the breac between the king and his two houses growing wider, the council of Scotland sent their chancellor in the month of May to renew their offers of a mediation between the two parties, which the king rejected as before;* and the rather, because they still insisted upon the abolishing of episcopacy, which his majesty believed to be of divine institution, and upon a uniformity of presbyterian government in the two nations: whereas the majority of both houses, being of Erastian principles, were under no difficulties about a change of discipline, apprehending that the civil magistrate might set up what form of government was most conducive to the good of the state. The parliament therefore treated the chancellor with great respect, and not only accepted the mediation, but wrote to the general assembly which was to meet in July, acquainting them with the crisis of their affairs, and desiring their advice and assistance in bringing about such a reformation as was desired. To which the assembly returned an answer, dated August 3, 1642, to the following purpose:

"After giving God thanks for the parliament's desire of a reformation of religion, and expressing their grief that it moves so slowly—They observe, that their commissioners, far from arrogance and presumption, had, with great respect and reverence, expressed their desires for unity of religion, that there might be one confession of faith, one directory of worship, one public catechism, and one form of church-government.† The assembly (say they) now enter upon the labours of the commissioners, being encouraged by the zeal of former times, when their predecessors sent a letter into England against the surplice, tippet, and corner-cap, in the year 1566, and again in the years 1583 and 1589. They are now farther encouraged by the king's late answer to their

* Duke of Hamilton's Memoirs, p. 3. p. 194.
† Rushworth, vol. 3. part 1. p. 507.

commissioners in their treaty for Ireland, wherein his majesty approves of the affection of his subjects of Scotland, in their desires of conformity of church-government; by his majesty's late practice while he was in Scotland, in resorting to their worship, and establishing it by act of parliament. They are also encouraged by a letter sent from many reverend brethren of the church of England, expressing their prayers and endeavours against every thing that shall be prejudicial to the establishment of the kingdom of Christ. They therefore advise to begin with a uniformity of church-government; for what hope can there be (say they) of one confession of faith, one form of worship and catechism, till prelacy be plucked up root and branch, as a plant which God had not planted? Indeed, the reformed kirks hold their form of government by presbyters to be *jure divino*, and perpetual, but prelacy is almost universally held by the prelates themselves to be a human ordinance, and may therefore be altered or abolished in cases of necessity, without wronging any man's conscience; for the accomplishing of which they promise their best assistance."

In the parliament's answer to this letter, "they acknowledge the friendship of their brethren of Scotland, and express their desires of unity in religion, that in all his majesty's dominions there might be but one confession of faith and form of church-government;* and though this is hardly to be expected punctually and exactly, yet they hope, since they are guided by the same spirit, they shall be so directed, as to cast out every thing that is offensive to God, and so far agree with the Scots, and other reformed churches, in the substantials of doctrine, worship, and discipline, that there may be a free communion in all holy exercises and duties of public worship, for the attaining whereof they intend an assembly of godly and learned divines, as soon as they can obtain the royal assent.——We have entered into a serious consideration (say they) what good we have received by the government of bishops, and do perceive it has been the occasion of many intolerable burdens and grievances, by their usurping a pre-eminence and power not given them by the word of God, &c. We find it has also been pernicious to our civil government, insomuch as the bishops have ever been forward to fill the minds of our princes with notions of an

* Rushworth, vol. 2. part 3. p. 890.

arbitrary power over the lives and liberties of the subject, by their counsels and in their sermons. Upon which accounts, and many others, we do declare, that this government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers depending upon the hierarchy, is evil, and justly offensive and burdensome to the kingdom, a great impediment to reformation, and very prejudicial to the civil government; and that we are resolved the same shall be taken away. And we desire our brethren of Scotland to concur with us in petitioning his majesty, that we may have an assembly of divines; and to send some of their own ministers to the said assembly, in order to obtain uniformity in church-government, that so a more easy passage may be made for settling one confession of faith, and directory of public worship, for the three kingdoms."

The king, being alarmed with the harmony between the two kingdoms, sent a warm remonstrance to the council of Scotland August 26, the very week he set up his standard at Nottingham, in which he declares,

"That he desired uniformity as much as they, in such a way as he in his conscience thought most serviceable to the true Protestant religion; but that his two houses of parliament had never made any proposition to him since their meeting, concerning uniformity of church-government; so far (says his majesty) are they from desiring such a thing, that we are confident the most considerable persons, and those who make the fairest pretensions to you of that kind, will not sooner embrace a presbyterial than you an episcopal.* And truly it seems, notwithstanding whatsoever profession they have made to the contrary, that nothing has been less in their minds, than settling the true religion, and reforming such abuses in the church as possibly may have crept in, contrary to the established laws of the land, to which we have been so far from being averse, that we have pressed them to it. And whenever any proposition shall be made to us by them, which we shall conceive may advance the unity of the Protestant religion, according to the word of God, or establish church-government, according to the known laws of the kingdom, we shall let the world see, that

* Duke of Hamilton's Memoirs, b. 4. p. 197.

nothing can be more agreeable to us than the advancing so good a work."

Here his majesty explains the uniformity he all along intended, and very justly observes, that the parliament no more believed the divine institution of presbytery, than others did of diocesan prelacy; for though they were content, in order to secure the assistance of the Scots nation, to vote away the power of archbishops and bishops, yet when they had conquered the king, and had nothing to fear from their neighbours, they could not be prevailed with to establish the Scots presbytery without reserving the power of the keys to themselves.

Lord Clarendon very justly observes "that the parliament were sensible they could not carry on the war but by the help of the Scots, which they were not to expect without an alteration of the government of the church, to which that nation was violently inclined, but that very much the major part of the members that continued in the parliament-house were cordially affected to the established government, at least not affected to any other."* But then to induce them to consent to such an alteration, it was said the Scots would not take up arms without it; so that they must lose all, and let the king return as a conqueror, or submit to the change. If it should be said, this would make a peace with the king impracticable, whose affection to the hierarchy all men knew, it was answered, that it was usual in treaties to ask more than was expected to be granted; and it might be, that their departing from their proposition concerning the church, might prevail with the king to give them the militia. Upon these motives the bill to abolish episcopacy was brought into the house and passed the commons September 1, and on the 10th of the same month it passed the lords. The noble historian says, that marvellous art and industry were used to obtain it; that the majority of the commons was really against it, and that it was very hardly submitted to by the house of peers. But the writer of the Parliamentary Chronicle, who was then at London, says, the bill passed *nullo contradicente*, not a negative vote being heard among them all; and that there were bonfires and ringing of bells for joy all over the city.†

* Clarendon, vol. 2. p. 117

† Parliamentary Chronicle, p. 150.

The bill was entitled, " An act for the utter abolishing and taking away of all archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries," &c.

It ordains, that " after the 5th of November 1643, there shall be no archbishop, bishop, chancellor, or commissary, of any archbishop or bishop, nor any dean, sub-dean, dean and chapter, archdeacon, nor any chancellor, chanter, treasurer, sub-treasurer, succentor, or sacrist, of any cathedral or collegiate church, nor any prebendary, canon, canon-residentiary, petty canon, vicar, choral, chorister, old vicars or new vicars, of or within any cathedral or collegiate churches in England or Wales.——That their names, titles, jurisdictions, offices, and functions, and the having or using any jurisdiction or power, by reason or colour of any such names and titles, shall cease, determine, and become absolutely void.

"That all the manors, lordships, castles, messuages, lands, tenements, rents, and all other possessions and hereditaments whatsoever, belonging to any archbishopric or bishoprick, shall be in the real and actual possession and seisin of the king's majesty, his heirs and successors, to hold and enjoy in as ample a manner as they were held by any archbishop or bishop within two years last past, except impropriations, parsonages, appropriate tithes, oblations, obventions, pensions, portions of tithes, parsonages, vicarages, churches, chapels, advowsons, nominations, collations, rights of patronage and presentation.

" That all impropriations, parsonages, tithes, &c. and all other hereditaments and possessions whatsoever, belonging to any dean, sub-dean and chapter, archdeacon, or any of their officers, be put into the hands of trustees, to pay to all and every archbishop, bishop, dean, sub-dean, archdeacon, and all other officers belonging to collegiate and cathedral churches, such yearly stipends and pensions as shall be appointed by parliament. And they shall dispose of all the aforesaid manors, lands, tithes, appropriations, advowsons, &c. for a competent maintenance for the support of such a number of preaching ministers in every cathedral and collegiate church as shall be appointed by parliament; and for the maintenance of preaching ministers in other places of the country where such maintenance is wanting; and for such

other good uses, to the advancement of religion, piety, and learning, as shall be directed by parliament.

"Provided, that all revenues and rents as have been, and now ought to be paid, for the maintenance of grammar-schools or scholars, or for the repairing any church, chapel, highway, causeway, bridges, school-house, alms-house, or other charitable uses, payable by any of the persons whose offices are taken away by this act, shall be continued. Provided also, that this act shall not extend to any college, church, corporation, foundation, or house of learning, in either of the universities."

It may seem strange that the parliament should abolish the present establishment before they had agreed on another, but the Scots would not declare for them till they had done it. Had the two houses been inclined to presbytery (as some have maintained), it had been easy to have adopted the Scots model at once; but as the bill for extirpating episcopacy was not to take place till above a year forward, it is apparent they were willing it should not take place at all, if in that time they could come to an accommodation with the king; and if the breach should then remain, they proposed to consult with an assembly of divines what form to erect in its stead. Thus the old English hierarchy lay prostrate for about eighteen years, although never legally abolished for want of the royal assent; and therefore at the restoration of king Charles II. it took place again, without any new law to restore it; which the Presbyterians, who were then in the saddle, not understanding, did not provide against as they might.

While the king and parliament were thus strengthening themselves, and calling in severally all the succours they could get, the scene of the war began to open; his majesty travelled with a large retinue into several of the northern and western counties, summoning the people together, and in set speeches endeavouring to possess them of the justice of his cause, promising, upon the word of a king, that for the future he would govern by law. Upon this assurance about forty lords, and several members who had deserted*

* Bishop Warburton censures Mr. Neal for using the word "deserted," "which (he says) is a party-word, and implies betraying their trust." His lordship owns that the conduct of the members, who left the house and retired to the king, was so

the house of commons, signed an engagement, to defend his majesty's person and prerogative, to support the Protestant religion established by law, and not to submit to any ordinance of parliament concerning the militia that had not the royal assent. Great numbers listed in his majesty's service, whereby an army was formed, which marched a second time to the siege of Hull.

A week after the king was set down before this fortress, and not before [July 12], the two houses, after long debates, came to this resolution, that an army should be raised for the defence of the king and parliament, that the earl of Essex should be captain-general, and the earl of Bedford general of the horse, who were empowered to resist and oppose with force all such whom they should find in arms, putting in execution the king's commission of array. The reasons of this resolution arising from the king's extraordinary preparations for war, were published at the same time; and in their declaration of August 4, they say, "that they would have yielded up every thing to the king, could they have been assured, that by disarming themselves they should not have been left naked, while the military sword was in the hands of those evil counsellors who they had reason to fear had vowed the destruction of the two houses, and, through their sides, of the Protestant religion; but being well acquainted with their designs, they apprehend that their duty to God and their country obliges them to hazard

called by the parliament; but an historian's adopting, in this case, the term which impeaches their fidelity, he considers "as taking for granted the thing in dispute." But, with his lordship's leave, his stricture confounds the province of the historian with that of the mere chronologist. The former does not merely detail events, but investigates their causes, and represents their connexion and influence. It is not easy to say, how he can do this, without forming and expressing a decided opinion on them. That opinion does not bind the reader, nor is the impartiality of the historian violated, if facts are fairly and fully stated. In the case before us, it may be further urged, that the word "deserted" not only conveyed Mr. Neal's idea of the conduct of the members who left the parliament, but truly represented it. They forsook the seats to which they were elected; they left the post which was assigned to them; and by withdrew from the stage of debate and action, to which the king's writ had called, and to which the voice of their constituents had sent them. They were representatives, chosen to act in conjunction with the other representatives: instead of proceeding on this principle, they formed a separate junto and faction. The first duty of a representative is to fulfil the trust reposed in him. The word "deserted," says his lordship, is a party-word: grant it. Yet the use of it was not inconsistent with the impartiality of the historian; for though it should not give the most favourable idea of the conduct of these members, it conveys the judgment which the parliament had of it: and of the rectitude of this judgment the reader is still left to form his own sentiments. The matter at the time was considered in the most serious light, and greatly alarmed and distressed all who loved the peace of the nation. See May's Parliamentary History, p. 31, &c. Ed.

every thing for the maintenance of the true religion, the king's person, honour, and estate, and the liberties of England." On the 9th of August the king proclaimed the earl of Essex and all his adherents traitors, unless they laid down their arms within six days; and in another manifesto declared both houses of parliament guilty of high treason, and forbid all his subjects to yield obedience to them. The parliament also, on their part, proclaimed all who adhered to the king in this cause traitors against the parliament and kingdom.* August 12, the king by proclamation commanded all his subjects on the north of Trent, and within twenty miles south of it, to appear in arms for the suppressing the rebels that were marching against him; and about the same time issued out another proclamation, requiring all men who could bear arms to repair to him at Nottingham, where he intended to set up his standard on Monday August 22. In the meantime his majesty gave out new commissions to augment his forces, and marching through Lincoln took away the arms of the train-bands for the use of his troops. At length, being arrived at the appointed place, he caused his standard to be erected in the open field, on the outside of the castle-wall at Nottingham, but very few came to attend it: and the weather proving stormy and tempestuous it was blown down the same evening, and could not be fixed again in two days. Three weeks after this [September 9], the earl of Essex, the parliament's general, left London, to put himself at the head of their army of fifteen thousand men at St. Alban's. The king, with an army of equal strength, marched from Nottingham to Shrewsbury, and having refreshed his forces there for some time, broke up October 12, in order to march directly for London, but the earl of Essex putting himself in the way, both armies engaged at Edgehill near Keinton in Warwickshire, on Sunday October 23, the very same day twelvemonth after the breaking out of the Irish massacre. The battle continued from three in the afternoon till night, with almost equal advantage, the number of slain on both sides being about four thousand. Thus the sword was drawn which was drenched in the blood of the inhabitants of this island for several years, to the loss of as many Protestant lives as perished by the insurrection and massacre of Ireland.

* Rapin, vol. 2. p. 457, folio edition.

CHAP. XII.

THE STATE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. THE RELIGIOUS CHARACTER OF BOTH PARTIES. WITH A SUMMARY OF THE GROUNDS OF THE CIVIL WAR.

We have already seen the unsettled state of religion upon the king's progress into Scotland, with the complaints of the royalists for want of decency and uniformity. The hierarchy had for some time been a dead weight, the springs that moved it being stopped, by the imprisonment of the bishops, and the check that was given to the spiritual courts; but now the whole fabric was taken down after a year, though when that was expired no other discipline was erected in its room; nor was the name, style, and dignity, of archbishops and bishops taken away by ordinance of parliament till September 5, 1646, that is, till the war was over, and the king a prisoner. In this interval there was properly no established form of government, the clergy being permitted to read more or less of the liturgy as they pleased,* and to govern their parishes according to their discretion. The vestments were left indifferent, some wearing them, and others, in imitation of the foreign Protestants, making use of a cloak. February 2, 1642—3, the commons ordered, that the statute of the university of Cambridge, which imposes the use of the surplice upon all students and graduates, should not be pressed, as being against the law and liberty of the subject; and three days after they made the same order for the schools of Westminster, Eton, and Winchester. Bishop Kennet says, that tithes were denied to those who read common prayer; and it is as true, that they were withheld from those that did not read it; for many, taking advantage of the confusion of the times, eased themselves of a burden for which some few pleaded conscience, and others the uncertain title of those that claimed them.

* Here, as Dr. Grey observes, is an inaccuracy. The use of the liturgy was not permitted during the whole of this interval, as appears by Mr. Neal's own account, Vol. 3; for it was prohibited, and the directory established in its room, previously to the abolition of the episcopal titles and dignity by ordinances of parliament on the 3d of January 1644-5, and 23d of August 1645.—Ed.

Though the parliament and Puritan clergy were averse to cathedral-worship, that is, to a variety of musical instruments, choristers, singing of prayers, anthems, &c. as unsuitable to the solemnity and simplicity of divine service, yet was it not prohibited; and though the revenues of prebendaries and deans, &c. had been voted useless, and more fit to be applied to the maintenance of preaching ministers, yet the stipends of those who did not take part with the king, were not sequestered till the latter end of the year 1645, when it was ordained, "that the deans and prebendaries of Westminster who had absented themselves, or were delinquents, or had not taken the covenant, should be suspended from their several offices and places, except Mr. Osbaldesdon;" but the names, titles, and offices, of deans and chapters, were not abolished till after the king's death, in the year 1649, the parliament proceeding with some caution, as long as there was any prospect of an accommodation with the king. Indeed, the beauty of the cathedrals was in some measure defaced about this time, by the ordinance for the removing crucifixes, images, pictures, and other monuments of superstition, out of churches. Many fine paintings in the windows and on the walls were broken and destroyed, without a decent repair of the damage. In Lambeth-chapel the organ was taken down [November 25]. The following summer the paintings, pictures, superstitious ornaments, and images, were defaced, or removed out of the cathedrals of Canterbury, Rochester, Chichester, Winchester, Worcester, Lincoln, Litchfield, Salisbury, Gloucester, St. Paul's in London, the collegiate church of Westminster, &c. "But (says my author) I do not find that they then seized the revenues and estates of the cathedrals, but contented themselves with plundering and imprisoning some of the principal members, and dispersing many of the rest; and several of those places coming afterward into his majesty's hands, the service did not wholly cease, nor were the doors of those stately fabrics finally closed at that time."

Though the discipline of the church was at an end, there was nevertheless an uncommon spirit of devotion among people in the parliament-quarters; the Lord's day was observed with remarkable strictness, the churches being crowded with numerous and attentive hearers three or four times

in the day; the officers of the peace patroled the streets, and shut up all public houses; there was no travelling on the road, or walking in the fields, except in cases of absolute necessity. Religious exercises were set up in private families, as reading the Scriptures, family prayer, repeating sermons, and singing of psalms, which was so universal, that you might walk through the city of London on the evening of the Lord's day, without seeing an idle person, or hearing any thing but the voice of prayer or praise from churches and private houses.

As is usual in times of public calamity, so at the breaking out of the civil war, all public diversions and recreations were laid aside. By an ordinance of September 2, 1642, it was declared, that "whereas public sports do not agree with public calamities, nor public stage-plays with the seasons of humiliation; this being an exercise of sad and pious solemnity; the other being spectacles of pleasure too commonly expressing lascivious mirth and levity; it is therefore ordained, that while these sad causes, and set times of humiliation, continue, public stage-plays shall cease and be forborne; instead of which are recommended to the people of this land, the profitable duties of repentance, and making their peace with God."*

The set times of humiliation mentioned in the ordinance, refers to the monthly fast appointed by the king, at the request of the parliament [January 8, 1641], on account of the Irish insurrection and massacre, to be observed every last Wednesday in the month, as long as the calamities of that nation should require it. But when the king set up his standard at Nottingham, the two houses, apprehending that England was now to be the seat of war, published an ordinance for the more strict observation of this fast, in order to implore a divine blessing upon the consultations of parliament, and to deprecate the calamities that threatened this nation. All preachers were enjoined to give notice of it from the pulpit the preceding Lord's day, and to exhort their hearers to a solemn and religious observation of the whole day, by a devout attendance on the service of God in some church or chapel, by abstinence, and by refraining from worldly business and diversions: all public houses were likewise forbid to sell any sorts of liquors (except in cases of

* Rushworth, vol. 3. p. 1. p. 1.

necessity) till the public exercises and religious duties of the day were ended; which continued with little or no intermission from nine in the morning till four in the afternoon; during which time the people were at their devotions, and the ministers engaged in one part or other of divine worship.

But besides the monthly fast, the opening of the war gave rise to another exercise of prayer, and exhortation to repentance, for an hour every morning in the week. Most of the citizens of London having some near relation or friend in the army of the earl of Essex, so many bills were sent up to the pulpit every Lord's day for their preservation, that the minister had neither time to read them, or to recommend their cases to God in prayer; it was therefore agreed by some London divines, to separate an hour for this purpose every morning, one half to be spent in prayer, and the other in a suitable exhortation to the people. The reverend Mr. Case, minister of St. Mary Magdalen, Milk-street, began it in his church at seven in the morning, and when it had continued there a month, it was removed by turns to other churches at a distance, for the accommodation of the several parts of the city, and was called the morning exercise. The service was performed by divers ministers, and earnest intercessions were made in the presence of a numerous and crowded audience, for the welfare of the public as well as particular cases. When the heat of the war was over, it became a casuistical lecture, and was carried on by the most learned and able divines till the restoration of king Charles II. Their sermons were afterward published in several volumes quarto, under the title of the Morning Exercises; each sermon being the resolution of some practical case of conscience. This lecture, though in a different form, is continued among the Protestant dissenters to this day.

Some time after another morning lecture was set up in the abbey-church of Westminster, between the hours of six and eight, for the benefit of that part of the town, and especially of the members of parliament; it was carried on by Dr. Staunton, Mr. Nye, Marshal, Palmer, Herle, Whitaker, and Hill, all members of the assembly of divines. In short, there were lectures and sermons every day in the week in one church or another, which were well attended, and with

great appearance of zeal and affection. Men were not backward to rise before day, and go to places of worship at a great distance, for the benefit of hearing the word of God. Such was the devotion of the city of London and parts adjacent, in these dangerous times!

Nor was the reformation of manners less remarkable; the laws against vice and profaneness were so strict, and so rigorously put in execution, that wickedness was forced to hide itself in corners. There were no gaming-houses, or houses of pleasure; no profane swearing, drunkenness, or any kind of debauchery, to be seen or heard in the streets. It is commonly said, that the religion of these times was no better than hypocrisy and dissimulation; and without all doubt, there were numbers of men who made the form of godliness a cloak to dishonesty; nay, it is probable, that hypocrisy, and other secret immoralities, might be the prevailing sins of the age, all open vices being suppressed; but still I am persuaded, that the body of the people were sincerely religious, and with all their faults, I should rejoice to see, in our days, such an appearance of religion, and all kinds of vice and profaneness so effectually discountenanced.

If we go from the city to the camp of the earl of Essex, we shall find no less probity of manners among them, most of his soldiers being men who did not fight so much for pay, as for religion and the liberties of their country. Mr. Whitelocke observes,* "that colonel Cromwell's regiment of horse were most of them freeholders' sons, who engaged in the war upon principles of conscience; and that being well armed within, by the satisfaction of their consciences, and without with good iron arms, they would as one man stand firmly and charge desperately." The same author adds, "that colonel Wilson, who was heir to an estate of 2,000*l.* a year, and was the only son of his father, put himself at the head of a gallant regiment of citizens, who listed themselves in the parliament's service purely upon conscience; this (says he) was the condition of many others also of like quality and fortune in those times, who had such an affection for their religion, and the rights and liberties of their country, that *pro aris et focis* they were willing to undergo any hardships or dangers, and thought no service

* Memorials, p. 68. Ibid. p. 72.

too much or too great for their country." The most eminent divines served as chaplains to the several regiments; Dr. Burges and Mr. Marshal were chaplains to the earl of Essex's regiment; Dr. Downing to lord Roberts; Mr. Sedgwick to colonel Hollis's; Dr. Spurstow to Mr. Hampden's; Mr. Aske to lord Brooks's, &c. While these continued, none of the enthusiastic follies that were afterward a reproach to the army, discovered themselves. There were among them some who afterward joined the sectaries; some who were mere mercenaries, and (if we may believe his majesty's declaration after the battle of Edgehill) some who were disguised Papists; but upon the whole, lord Clarendon confesses, there was an exact discipline in the army; that they neither plundered nor robbed the country; all complaints of this kind being redressed in the best manner, and the offenders punished. The reverend Mr. Baxter, who was himself in the army, gives this account of them:* "The generality of those people throughout England who went by the name of Puritans, Precisians, Presbyterians, who followed sermons, prayed in their families, read books of devotion, and were strict observers of the sabbath, being avowed enemies to swearing, drunkenness, and all kinds of profaneness, adhered to the parliament; with these were mixed some young persons of warm heads, and enthusiastical principles, who laid the foundation of those sects and divisions which afterward spread over the whole nation, and were a disgrace to the cause which the parliament had espoused. Of the clergy, those who were of the sentiments of Calvin, who were constant preachers of the word of God themselves, and encouragers of it in others; who were zealous against Popery, and wished for a reformation of the discipline of the church, were on the parliament's side. Among these were some of the elder clergy, who were preferred before the rise of archbishop Laud: all the deprived and silenced ministers, with the whole body of lecturers and warm popular preachers, both in town and country; these drew after them great numbers of the more serious and devout people, who were not capable of judging between the king and parliament, but followed their spiritual guides from a veneration they had for their integrity and piety. Many went into the parliament, and filled

* Baxter's Life, p. 50, 51, 52, &c. fol.

up their armies afterward, merely because they heard men swear for the common prayer and bishops, and heard others pray that were against them: because they heard the king's soldiers with horrid oaths abuse the name of God, and saw them live in debauchery, while the parliament-soldiers flocked to sermons, talked of religion, and prayed and sung psalms together on their guards. And all the sober men that I was acquainted with, who were against the parliament (says Mr. Baxter), used to say, the king had the better cause, but the parliament had the better men."*

The Puritan [or parliament] clergy were zealous Calvinists, and having been prohibited for some years from preaching against the Arminians, they now pointed all their artillery against them, insisting upon little else in their sermons, but the doctrines of predestination, justification by faith alone, salvation by free grace, and the inability of man to do that which is good. The duties of the second table were too much neglected; from a strong aversion to Arminianism these divines unhappily made way for Antinomianism, verging from one extreme to another, till at length some of the weaker sort were lost in the willd mazes of enthusiastic dreams and visions, and others from false principles pretended to justify the hidden works of dishonesty. The assembly of divines did what they could to put a stop to the growth of these pernicious errors; but the great scarcity of preachers of a learned education, who took part with the parliament, left some pulpits in the country empty, and the people to be led aside in many places, by every bold pretender to inspiration.

"The generality of the stricter and more diligent sort of preachers (says Mr. Baxter) joined the parliament, and took shelter in their garrisons; but they were almost all conformable ministers; the laws and the bishops having cast out the Nonconformists long enough before, and not left above two in a county: those who made up the assembly of divines, and who through the land were the honour of the

* To the authorities quoted by Mr. Neal, Bishop Warburton opposes that of Oliver Cromwell, who, in his speech to his parliament, represented the Presbyterian armies of the parliament, as chiefly made up, before the self-denying ordinance, of decayed "serving-men, broken tapsters, and men without any sense of religion: and that it was his business to inspire that spirit of religion into his troops on the reform, to oppose the principle of honour in the king's troops, made up of gentlemen." Ed.

parliament-party, were almost all such as till then had conformed, and took the ceremonies to be lawful in cases of necessity, but longed to have that necessity removed." He admits, "that the younger and less experienced ministers in the country, were against amending the bishops and liturgy, apprehending this was but gilding over their danger; but that this was not the sense of the parliament, nor of their principal divines. The matter of bishops or no bishops (says he) was not the main thing, except with the Scots, for thousands that wished for good bishops were on the parliament-side. Almost all those afterward called Presbyterians, and all that learned and pious synod at Westminster, except a very few, had been conformists, and kept up an honourable esteem for those bishops that they thought religious; as, archbishop Usher, bishop Davenant, Hall, Moreton, &c. These would have been content with an amendment of the hierarchy, and went into the parliament, because they apprehended the interests of religion and civil liberty were on that side."*

But the political principles of these divines gave the greatest disgust to the royalists; they encouraged the people to stand by the parliament, and preached up the lawfulness of defending their religion and liberties against the king's evil counsellors. They were for a limited monarchy, agreeable to our present happy constitution, for which, and for what they apprehended the purity of the Protestant religion, they contended, and for nothing more; but for this they have suffered in their moral character, and have been left upon record as rebels, traitors, enemies to God and their king, &c.† His majesty, in one of his declarations, calls them "ignorant in learning, turbulent and seditious in disposition, scandalous in life, unconformable to the laws of the land, libellers, revilers both of church and state, and preachers of sedition and treason itself." Lord Clarendon says, "that under the notion of reformation, and extirpating Popery, they infused seditious inclinations into the hearts of men against the present government of the church and state; that when the army was raised they contained themselves within no bounds, and inveighed as freely against the person of the king, as they had before against the worst malig-

* Burnet's Life, p. 35. 35. 37.

† Husband's Collections, p. 514, &c.

nants, profanely and blasphemously applying what had been spoken by the prophets against the most wicked and impious kings, to stir up the people against their most gracious sovereign." His lordship adds, "that the Puritan clergy were the chief incendiaries, and had the chief influence in promoting the civil war. The kirk-reformation in Scotland and in this kingdom (says his lordship) was driven on by no men so much as those of their clergy; and without doubt the archbishop of Canterbury never had such an influence over the councils at court, as Dr. Burges and Mr. Marshal had then on the houses; nor did all the bishops of Scotland together so much meddle in temporal affairs as Mr. Henderson had done."*

Strange! when the Scots bishops were advanced to the highest posts of honour and civil trust in that kingdom; and when archbishop Laud had the direction of all public affairs in England, for twelve years together. Was not the archbishop at the head of the council-table, the star-chamber, and the court of high-commission? Was not his grace the contriver or promoter of all the monopolies and oppressions that brought on the civil war? What could the Puritan clergy do like this? Had they any places of profit or trust under the government, or any commissions in the ecclesiastical courts? Did they amass to themselves great riches or large estates? No; they renounced all civil power and jurisdiction, as well as lordly titles and dignities; and were, for the most part, content with a very moderate share of the world. If they served the parliament-cause, it was in visiting their parishioners, and by their sermons from the pulpits: here they spent their zeal, praying and preaching as men who were in earnest for what they apprehended the cause of God and their country. But it is easy to remark, that the noble historian observes no measure with the Puritan clergy when they fall in his way.

Nor were the parliament-divines the chief incendiaries between the king and people, if we may believe Mr. Baxter, who knew the Puritans of those times much better than his lordship. "It is not true (says this divine†) that they stirred up the people to war, there was hardly one such man in a county, though they disliked the late innovations, and were glad the parliament were attempting a reformation."

* Vol. 1 p. 302. † Baxter's Life, p. 34.

They might inveigh too freely in their sermons against the vices of the clergy, and the severities of the late times; but in all the fast-sermons that I have read,* for some years after the beginning of the war, I have met with no reflections upon the person of the king, but a religious observation of that political maxim, The king can do no wrong.

His lordship adds, that "they profanely and blasphemously applied what had been spoken by the prophets against the most wicked and impious kings, to stir up the people against their most gracious sovereign." If this were really the case, yet the king's divines came not behind them in applying the absolute dominion of the kings of Judah in support of the unbounded prerogative of the kings of England, and in cursing the parliament, and pronouncing damnation upon all who died in their service. I could produce a large catalogue of shocking expressions to this purpose, but I wish such offences buried in oblivion, and we ought not to form our judgments of great bodies of men, from the excesses of a few.

We shall have an opportunity, hereafter, to compare the learning of the Puritan divines† with the royalists, when it will appear, that there were men of no less eminence for literature with the parliament than with the king, as the Seldens, the Lightfoots, the Cudworths, the Pococks, the Whichcotes, the Arrowsmiths, &c. but as to their morals,

* Dr. Grey, who mistakes this for the assertion of Mr. Baxter instead of Mr. Neal, opposes to it his own remark on the fast-sermons between the year 1640 and the death of the king: from which, he says, he could produce hundreds of instances for the disproof of what is said above. As a specimen, he quotes many passages from sermons of the most popular and leading men of those times. Some of these passages, it appears to me, point strongly at the king, and go to prove that royal personages are amenable for evil conduct. But, besides that they are given detached from their connexion, it is to be considered, that if Mr. Neal had read the same discourses, they would affect his mind differently from what they did Dr. Grey: who, through all his animadversions, appears to have looked on Charles as an immaculate prince, and to have been a disciple to the advocates for passive obedience and nonresistance.—Ed.

† Mr. Neal is here charged with contradicting what he had said p. 509, where he speaks of "the great scarcity of preachers of a learned education." This is said, when Mr. Neal is representing the difficulty the assembly of divines had to supply the pulpits through the country. This might be the case when speaking of the kingdom at large, and yet there might be some of no less eminence for literature than any who sided with the king. Mr. Neal gives the names of such. But bishop Warburton will not allow, that they were of the parliament-party: "the most that can be said of them is (he adds), that they submitted to the power." But their acting with the assembly of divines was, certainly, more than a submission to power; it was taking a lead in the affairs of the parliament: this, if the cause had been repugnant to their principles, they might, and as honest men would, have declined doing: as did bp Usher, Dr. Holdsworth, and the other episcopalian divines who were also chosen to attend the assembly, but who stayed away from it; because it was not, in their opinion, a legal convocation.—Ed.

their very adversaries will witness for them. Dr. G. Bates, an eminent royalist, in his Elenchus, gives them this character, "Moribus severis essent, in concionibus vehementes, precibus et piis officiis prompti, uno verbo ad cætera boni:" i. e. "They were men of severe and strict morals, warm and affectionate preachers, fervent in prayer, ready to all pious offices, and in a word, otherwise [that is, abating their political principles] good men." And yet with all their goodness they were unacquainted with the rights of conscience, and when they got the spiritual sword into their hands managed it very little better than their predecessors the bishops.

The clergy who espoused the king's cause were, the bench of bishops, the whole body of the cathedral, and the major part of the parochial clergy, with the heads, and most of the fellows of both universities, among whom were men of the first rank for learning, politeness, piety, and probity of manners, as archbishop Usher, bishop Hall, Moreton, Westfield, Brownrigge, Prideaux, Dr. Hammond, Saunderson, &c. who joined the king, not merely for the sake of their preferments, but because they believed the unlawfulness of subjects resisting their sovereign in any case whatsoever. Among the parochial clergy were men of no less name and character. Lord Clarendon* says, "that if the sermons of those times preached at court were collected together and published, the world would receive the best bulk of orthodox divinity, profound learning, convincing reason, natural powerful eloquence, and admirable devotion, that hath been communicated in any age since the apostles' time." And yet, in the very same page, he adds, "There was sometimes preached there, matter very unfit for the place, and scandalous for the persons." I submit this paragraph to the reader's judgment; for I must confess, that after having read over several of these court-sermons, I have not been able to discover all that learning and persuasive eloquence which his lordship admires; nor can much be said for their orthodoxy, if the thirty-nine articles be the standard. But whatever decency was observed at court, there was hardly a sermon preached by the inferior clergy within the king's quarters, wherein the parliament divines were not severely exposed and ridiculed, under the character of Puritans, Precisians, Formalists, Sabbatarians, canting hypocrites, &c. Such was the sharpness of men's spirits on both sides!

* Vol. 1. p. 77.

Among the country clergy there was great room for complaints, many of them being pluralists, nonresidents, ignorant and illiterate, negligent of their cures, seldom or never visiting their parishioners, or discharging any more of their function than would barely satisfy the law. They took advantage of the book of sports to attend their parishioners to their wakes and revels, by which means many of them became scandalously immoral in their conversations. Even Dr. Walker admits, that there were among them men of wicked lives, and such as were a reproach and scandal to their function; the particulars of which had better have been buried than left upon record.*

The common people that filled up the king's army were of the looser sort; and even the chief officers, as, lord Goring, Granville, Wilmot, and others, were men of profligate lives, and made a jest of religion; the private sentinels were soldiers of fortune, and not having their regular pay, lived for the most part upon free plunder: when they took possession of a town, they rifled the houses of all who were called Puritans, and turned their families out of doors. Mr. Baxter says, "that when he lived at Coventry after the battle of Edgehill, there were above thirty worthy ministers in that city who had fled thither for refuge from the soldiers and popular fury, as he himself also had done, though they had never meddled in the wars; among these were, the reverend Mr. Vines, Mr. Anthony Burgess, Mr. Burdal, Mr. Bromshil, Dr. Bryan, Grew, Craddock, and others. And here (says he) I must repeat the great cause of the parliament's strength, and of the king's ruin; the debauched rabble, encouraged by the gentry, and seconded by the common soldiers of his army, took all that were called Puritans for their enemies; so that if any man was noted for a strict and famous preacher, or for a man of a precise and pious life, he was plundered, abused, and put in danger of his life; if a man prayed in his family, or was heard to repeat a sermon, or sing a psalm, they presently cried out, Rebels, roundheads, and all their money and goods proved guilty, however innocent they were themselves. Upon my certain knowledge it was this that filled the armies and garrisons of the parliament with sober and pious men. Thousands had no mind to meddle in the wars, but to live peaceably at home, if the rage of the soldiers and drunkards would have suffered them.

* Sufferings of the Clergy, p. 72.

Some stayed at home till they had been imprisoned; some till they had been plundered twice or thrice over, and had nothing left; others were quite tired out with the insolence of their neighbours; with being quartered upon, and put in continual danger of their lives, and so they sought refuge in the parliament-garrisons."*

This was so notorious, that at length it came to the king's ear, who, out of mere compassion to his distressed subjects, issued out a proclamation, bearing date November 25, 1642, for the better government of his army; the preamble of which sets forth, "that his majesty, having taken into his princely consideration the great misery and ruin of his subjects, by the plundering, robbing, and spoiling, of their houses, and taking from them their money, plate, household-stuff, cattle, and other goods, under pretence of their being disaffected to us and our service, and these unlawful and unjust actions done by divers soldiers of our army, and others sheltering themselves under that title; his majesty, detesting such barbarous proceedings, forbids his officers and soldiers to make any such seizures for the future, without his warrant. And if they go on to plunder and spoil the people, by taking away their money, plate, household-goods, oxen, sheep, or other cattle; or any victuals, corn, hay, or other provisions, going to or from any market, without making satisfaction, his majesty orders them to be proceeded against by martial law." This was as much as the king could do in his present circumstances; yet it had very little effect, for his majesty having neither money or stores for his army, the officers could maintain no discipline, and were forced to connive at their living at free quarter upon the people.

Thus this unhappy nation was miserably harassed, and thrown into terrible convulsions, by an unnatural civil war; the nobility and gentry, with their dependants, being chiefly with the king; the merchants, tradesmen, substantial farmers, and in general the middle ranks of people, siding with the parliament.

It is of little consequence to inquire, who began this unnatural and bloody war. None will blame them, on whose part it was just and unavoidable, for taking all necessary precautions in their defence, and making use of such advantages as Providence put into their hands to defeat the de-

* Baxter's Life, p. 41.

signs of the enemy, and nothing can excuse the other. His majesty professed before God to his nobles at York, that he had no intention to make war upon his parliament. And in his last speech on the scaffold he affirms, "that he did not begin a war with the two houses of parliament, but that they began with him upon the point of the militia; and if any body will look upon the dates of the commissions (says his majesty), theirs and mine, they will see clearly that they began these unhappy troubles, and not I." Yet with all due submission to so great an authority, were the dates of commissions for raising the militia the beginning of the war? Were not the crown-jewels first pawned in Holland, and arms, ammunition, and artillery, sent over to the king at York? Did not his majesty summon the gentlemen and freeholders to attend him as an extraordinary guard, in his progress in the north, and appear before Hull in a warlike manner, before the raising the militia? Were not these warlike preparations? Dr. Welwood says, and I think all impartial judges must allow, that they look very much that way. Mr. Echard is surprised that "the king did not put himself into a posture of defence sooner;"* but he would have ceased to wonder, if he had remembered the words of lord Clarendon: "The reason why the king did not raise forces sooner was, because he had neither arms nor ammunition, and till these could be procured from Holland, let his provocations and sufferings be what they would, he was to submit and bear it patiently." It was therefore no want of will, but mere necessity, that hindered the king's appearing in arms sooner than he did. Father Orleans confesses, that it was agreed with the queen in the cabinet-council at Windsor, that while her majesty was negotiating in Holland, the king should retire to York and there make his first levies. He adds, "that all mankind believed that his majesty was under-hand preparing for war, that the sword might cut asunder those knots he had made with his pen."

In order to excuse the unhappy king, who was sacrificed in the house of his friends, a load of guilt is with great justice laid upon the queen, who had a plenitude of power over his majesty, and could turn him about which way she pleased. Bishop Burnet says, "that by the liveliness of her discourse she made great impressions upon the king; so that to the queen's want of judgment, and the king's own temper,

* Memoirs, p. 64.

the sequel of all his misfortunes was owing."* Bishop Kennet adds, that "the king's match with this lady was a greater judgment upon the nation, than the plague which then raged in the land; and that the influence of a stately queen over an affectionate husband, proved very fatal both to prince and people, and laid in a vengeance for future generations." The queen was a great bigot to her religion, and was directed by her father confessor to protect the Roman Catholics, even to the hazard of the king's crown and dignity. Though his majesty usually consulted her in all affairs of state, yet she sometimes presumed to act without him, and to make use of his name without his knowledge. "It was the queen that made all the great officers of state (says lord Clarendon), no preferments were bestowed without her allowance." She was an enemy to parliaments, and pushed the king upon the most arbitrary and unpopular actions, to rase the English government to a level with the French. It was the queen that countenanced the Irish insurrection; that obliged the king to go to the house of commons and seize the five members; and that was at the head of the council at Windsor, in which it was determined to break with the parliament and prepare for war; "this (says the noble historian; viz. the king's perfect adoration of his queen, his resolution to do nothing without her), and his being inexorable as to every thing he promised her, were the root and cause of all other grievances. The two houses often petitioned the king not to admit her majesty into his councils, or to follow her advice in matters of state; but he was not to be moved from his too servile regards to her dictates, even to the day of his death.

Sundry others of his majesty's privy-council had their share in bringing on the calamities of the war, though when it broke out they were either dead, dispersed, or imprisoned; as, the duke of Buckingham, earl of Strafford, archbishop Laud, Finch, Windebank, Noy, &c. These had been the most busy actors at the council-table, the star-chamber, and court of high-commission, and were at the head of all the monopolies and illegal projects that enslaved the nation for above twelve years, and might have done it for ever, had they been good husbands of the public treasure, and not brought upon themselves the armed force of a neighbouring nation. The politics of these statesmen were very unac-

* History of his Life and Times, vol. 1 p. 59, Scotch edition.

countable, for as long as they could subsist without a parliamentary supply, they went on with their ship-money, court and conduct money, monopolies, and such-like resources of the prerogative; as soon as the parliament sat, these were suspended, in expectation of a supply from the two houses, before they had inquired into the late inroads upon the constitution; but when they found this could not be obtained, they broke up the parliament in disgust, fined and imprisoned the members for their freedom of speech, and returned to their former methods of arbitrary government. All king Charles's parliaments had been thus dissolved, even to the present, which would undoubtedly have been treated in the same manner, had it not been for the act of continuation.*

On the other hand, a spirit of English liberty had been growing in the nation for some years, and the late oppressions, instead of extinguishing it, had only kept it under ground, till having collected more strength, it burst out with the greater violence; the patriots of the constitution watched all opportunities to recover it: yet, when they had obtained a parliament by the interposition of the Scots, they were disposed to take a severe revenge upon their late oppressors, and to enter upon too violent measures in order to prevent the return of power into those hands that had so shamefully abused it. The five members of the house of commons, and their friends who were concerned in inviting the Scots into England, saw their danger long before the king came to the house to seize them, which put them upon concerting measures not only to restore the constitution, but to lay farther limitations upon the royal power for a time, that they might not be exposed to the mercy of an incensed prince, as soon as he should be delivered from the present parliament. It is true, his majesty offered a general pardon at the breaking up of the session, but these members were afraid to rely upon it, because, as was said, there was no appearance that his majesty would govern by law for the future, any more than he had done before.

* This act has been called "a violent breach of the constitution of this government:" but the author who has cast this reproach on it, also observes, that "if this act had not been obtained, perhaps it would have been impossible to oppose the king's attempts with effect." On this ground the "act of continuation" has been called "an act of fidelity of the representatives of the people to their constituents: an instance of the expedience and righteousness of recovering the violated constitution, by means not strictly justifiable when the times are peaceable, and the curators of government just and upright." Memoirs of Hollis, vol. 2. p. 591.—Ed.

The king, being made sensible of the designs and spirit of the commons, watched all opportunities to disperse them, and not being able to gain his point, resolved to leave the two houses, and act no longer in concert with them, which was in effect to determine their power; for to what purpose should they sit, if the king will pass none of their bills; and forbid his subjects to obey any of their votes or ordinances till they had received the royal assent? It was this that dismembered and broke the constitution, and reduced the parliament to this dilemma, either to return home, and leave all things in the hands of the king and queen and their late ministry; or to act by themselves, as the guardians of the people, in a time of imminent danger: had they dissolved themselves, or stood still while his majesty had garrisoned the strong fortresses of Portsmouth and Hull, and got possession of all the arms, artillery, and ammunition, of the kingdom; had they suffered the fleet to fall into his majesty's hands, and gone on meekly petitioning for the militia, or for his majesty's return to his two houses of parliament, till the queen was returned with foreign recruits, or the Irish at liberty to send his majesty succours, both they and we must in all probability have been buried in the ruins of the liberties of our country. The two houses were not insensible of the risk they ran in crossing the measures of their sovereign, under whose government they thought they were to live, and who had counsellors about him who wou'd not fail to put him upon the severest reprisals, as soon as the sword of the kingdom should return into his hands; but they apprehended that their own and the public safety was at stake; that the king was preparing to act against them, by raising extraordinary guards to his person, and sending for arms and ammunition from abroad; therefore they ventured to make a stand in their own defence, and to perform such acts of sovereignty as were necessary to put it out of the power of the court, to make them a sacrifice to the resentments of their enemies.

But though in a just and necessary war, it is of little moment to inquire who began it, it is nevertheless of great consequence to consider on which side the justice of it lies. Let us therefore take a short view of the arguments on the king's side with the parliament's reply.

I. It was argued by the royalists, "that all grievances both real and imaginary were removed by the king's giving

up ship-money, by his abolishing the court of honour, the star-chamber, and high-commission, and by his giving up the bishops' votes in parliament."*

The parliament writers own these to be very important concessions, though far from comprehending all the real grievances of the nation. The queen was still at the head of his majesty's councils, without whose approbation no considerable affairs of government were transacted. None of the authors of the late oppressions had been brought to justice, except the earl of Strafford; and it is more than probable, if the parliament had been dissolved, they would not only have been pardoned, but restored to favour.—Though bishops were deprived of their seats in parliament, yet the defects in the public service, of which the Puritans complained, were almost untouched, nor were any effectual measures taken to prevent the growth of Popery, which threatened the ruin of the Protestant religion.

2. It was argued farther, "that the king had provided against any future oppressions of the subjects by consenting to the act for triennial parliaments."

To this it was replied, that the triennial act, in the present situation of the court, was not a sufficient security of our laws and liberties; for suppose at the end of three years, when the king was in full possession of the regal power, having all the forts and garrisons, arms and ammunition, of the kingdom at his disposal, with his old ministry about him, the council should declare, that the necessity of his majesty's affairs obliged him to dispense with the triennial act, what sheriff of a county, or other officer, would venture to put it in execution? Besides, had not the king, from this very principle, suspended and broke through the laws of the land for twelve years together before the meeting of this present parliament? And did not his majesty yield to the new laws with a manifest reluctance? Did he not affect to call them acts of grace, and not of justice? Were not some of them extorted from him by such arguments as these: "that his consent to them being forced, they were in themselves invalid, and might be avoided in better times?" Lord Clarendon says,† he had reason to believe this; and if his lordship believed it, I cannot see how it can reasonably be called in question. Bishop Burnet is of the same mind, and declares, in the history of his life and times, "that his

* Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 262. † Ibid. p. 430.

majesty never came into his concessions seasonably, nor with a good grace; all appeared to be extorted from him; and there were grounds to believe, that he intended not to stand to them any longer than he lay under that force that visibly drew them upon him, contrary to his own inclinations." To all which we may add the words of father Orleans the Jesuit, who says, "that all mankind believed at that time, that the king did not grant so much but in order to revoke all."*

3. It was said, "that the king had seen his mistake, and had since vowed and protested, in the most solemn manner, that for the future he would govern according to law."

To this it was replied, that if the petition of right so solemnly ratified from the throne, in presence of both houses of parliament, was so quickly broke through, what dependence could be had upon the royal promise? For though the king himself might be a prince of virtue and honour, yet his speeches, says Mr. Rapin, were full of ambiguities and secret reserves, that left room for different interpretations; besides, many things were transacted without his knowledge, and therefore so long as the queen was at the head of his councils, they looked upon his royal word only as the promise of a minor, or of a man under superior direction; which was the most favourable interpretation that could be made of the many violations of it in the course of fifteen years. "The queen, who was directed by Popish counsels (says bishop Burnet), could, by her sovereign power, make the king do whatsoever she pleased."

4. It was farther urged, "that the parliament had invaded the royal prerogative, and usurped the legislative power, without his majesty's consent, by claiming the militia, and the approbation of the chief officers both civil and military, and by requiring obedience to their votes and ordinances."

This the two houses admitted, and insisted upon it as their right, in cases of necessity and extreme danger; of which necessity and danger, they, as the guardians of the nation, and two parts in three of legislature, were the proper judges: "The question is not (say they) whether the king be the fountain of justice and protection, or whether the execution of the laws belongs primarily to him? But if the king shall refuse to discharge that duty and trust, and shall desert his parliament, and in a manner abdicate the government, whether there be not a power in the two houses

* History of his Own Times, vol. 1. p. 40. Edinburgh.

to provide for the safety and peace of the kingdom? or, if there be no parliament sitting, whether the nation does not return to a state of nature, and is not at liberty to provide for its own defence by extraordinary methods?" This seems to have been the case in the late glorious revolution of king William and queen Mary, when the constitution being broken, a convention of the nobility and commonalty was summoned without the king's writ, to restore the religion and liberties of the people, and place the crown upon another head.

5. The king on his part maintained, that "there was no danger from him, but that all the danger was from a malignant party in the parliament, who were subverting the constitution in church and state. His majesty averred, that God and the laws had intrusted him with the guardianship and protection of his people, and that he would take such care of them as he should be capable of answering for it to God."

With regard to dangers and fears, the parliament appealed to the whole world, whether there were not just grounds for them, after his majesty had violated the petition of right, and attempted to break up the present parliament, by bringing his army to London; after he had entered their house with an armed force, to seize five of their members; after he had deserted his parliament, and resolved to act no longer in concert with them; after his majesty had begun to raise forces under pretence of extraordinary guard to his person, and endeavoured to get the forts and ammunition of the kingdom into his possession, against the time when he should receive supplies from abroad; after they had seen the dreadful effects of a bloody and unparalleled insurrection and massacre of the Protestants in Ireland, and were continually alarmed with the increase and insolent behaviour of the Papists at home; and lastly, after they had found it impracticable, by their most humble petitions and remonstrances, to remove the queen and her cabal of Papists from the direction of the king's councils; after all these things (say they) "we must maintain the grounds of our fears to be of that moment, that we cannot discharge the trust and duty which lie upon us, unless we do apply ourselves to the use of those means, which God and the laws have put into our hands, for the necessary defence and safety of the kingdom."*

There were certainly strong and perhaps unreasonable

* Rapin, p. 468.

jealousies, and apprehensions of danger on both sides. The king complained, that he was driven from Whitehall by popular tumults, where neither his person or family could remain in safety. He was jealous (as he said) for the laws and liberties of his people, and was apprehensive that his parliament intended to change the constitution, and wrest the sceptre and sword out of his royal hands. On the other side, the two houses had their fears and distrusts of their own and the public safety; they were apprehensive, that if they put the forts and garrisons and all the strength of the kingdom into his majesty's power, as soon as they were dissolved, he, by the influence of his queen and his old counsellors, would return to his maxims of arbitrary government, and never call another parliament; that he would take a severe revenge upon those members who had exposed his measures, and disgraced his ministers; and in a word, that he would break through the late laws, as having been extorted from him by force or violence; but it was very much in the king's power, even at the treaty of Uxbridge in 1644—5, to have removed these distrusts, and thereby have saved both himself, the church, and the nation; for, as the noble historian observes, "the parliament took none of the points of controversy less to heart, or were less united in any thing, than in what concerned the church."* And with regard to the state, that "many of them were for peace, provided they might have indemnity for what was past, and security for time to come." Why then were not this indemnity and security offered? which must necessarily have divided the parliamentarians, and obliged the most rigorous and violent to recede from their high and exorbitant demands; and by consequence have restored the king to the peaceable possession of his throne.

Upon the whole, if we believe with the noble historian, and the writers on his side, "that the king was driven by violence from his palace at Whitehall, and could not return with safety; that all real and imaginary grievances of church and state were redressed; and that the kingdom was sufficiently secured from all future inroads of Popery and arbitrary power by the laws in being;" then the justice and equity of the war were most certainly with the king. Whereas, if we believe "that the king voluntarily deserted his parliament, and that it was owing alone to his majesty's own

* Vol. 2. p. 581. 594.

peremptory resolution, that he would not return (as lord Clarendon admits).—If by this means the constitution was broken, and the ordinary courts of justice necessarily interrupted.—If there were sundry grievances still to be redressed, and the king resolved to shelter himself under the laws in being, and to make no farther concessions.—If there were just reasons to fear," with bishop Burnet and father Orleans, that the king "would abide by the late laws no longer than he was under that force that brought them upon him."—In a word, "if in the judgment of the majority of lords and commons, the kingdom was in imminent danger of the return of Popery and arbitrary power, and his majesty would not condescend so much as to a temporary security for their satisfaction;" then we must conclude, that the cause of the parliament at the commencement of the war, and for some years after, was not only justifiable, but commendable and glorious; especially if we believe their own most solemn protestation,* in the presence of Almighty God, to the kingdom and to the world; "that no private passion or respect, no evil intention to his majesty's person, no designs to the prejudice of his just honour or authority, had engaged them to raise forces, and take up arms against the authors of this war in which the kingdom is inflamed."†

* Rushworth, vol. 2. part 3. p. 26.

† Bishop Warburton grants, that "Charles was a man of ill faith:" from whence arose the question, "whether he was to be trusted? Here (he adds) we must begin to distinguish. It was one thing, whether those particulars, who had personally offended the king, in the manner by which they extorted this amends from him; and another, whether the public, on all principles of civil government, ought not to have sat down satisfied. I think particulars could not safely take his word; and that the public could not honestly refuse it. You will say then, the leaders in parliament were justified in their mistrust. Here, again, we must distinguish. Had they been private men, we should not dispute it. But they bore another character; they were representatives of the public, and should therefore have acted in that capacity." Some will consider these distinctions, set up by his lordship, as favouring more of chicanery than solid reasoning. The simple question is, Was Charles worthy to be trusted? No! His lordship grants, that he was a man of ill faith. How then could the representatives of the people honestly commit the national interest to a man, whose duplicity and insincerity had repeatedly deceived them: and in deceiving them had deceived the public? If they could not safely take his word for themselves; how could they do it for their constituents? In all their negotiations with him, they had been acting not for themselves only, but for the nation. It was inconsistent with the trust invested in them to sacrifice or risk the national welfare by easy credulity; a credulity, which in their private concerns wisdom and prudence would have condemned. Besides, the insincerity of Charles had been so notorious, they had no ground to suppose that the public could or would take his word: much less that the public would expect or approve of their doing it; to whom the proofs of his insincerity offered themselves immediately and with all their force.—Ed.

END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

Printed by J. F. Dove, St. John's Square.

00066895

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 02 January, 2016